13

TWO LETTERS

WRITTEN

To the AUTHOR of a PAMPHLET,

ENTITULED,

Solomon and Abiathar:

OR,

The CASE of the Deprived Biſhops and Clergy DISCUSSED.

Samuel Grubcombe

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW YORK

PSAL. 50. 18.

When thou ſaweſt a Thief, then thou conſenteds't with him; and haſt been Partaker with Adulterers.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year MDCXCII.

Deborah Bridford Levinson

Assistant Clerk

Supreme Court of the United States

Washington, D. C. 20543

(202) 479-3030

The First LETTER.

SIR,

ENcouraged by your *Preface*, I take the freedom to ſend you theſe few lines. You acknowledge ſome ſuch *defects* as to your ſelf, that you cannot make a *ſatisfactory* reply to your *own Conſcience*; and I am ſorry you ſhould Print a Caſe for the Information of others, of which you was never throughly ſatisfied your ſelf. That you have ſufficiently conſulted our Adverſaries, I make no doubt, becauſe I find in your Book thoſe two main things wherein their great ſtrength conſiſts, *Lyes* and *Diſguiſes*. As for the firſt, they have plainly impoſed upon you, contrary to their own Knowledge and Conſcience; and as to the other, they have inſtilled into you their very Art: But had you taken *Aſtræa*'s Motto along with you (*Audi alteram partem,*) and as freely conſulted ſome of my ſuffering Brethren, as you have done their ſly but implacable Foes, I am confident you had ſet this Controverſie in a much clearer light, and not written (as you intimate you have now done) with a reluctancy of Mind and Conſcience. But ſince you call us in to your aid, though ſo very late, we are willing, as becomes Chriſtians, to comply with your honeſt requeſt; and I ſcruple not in behalf of my Brethren to promiſe you full information, and that the matter ſhall be handled mildly, cloſely, and fairly, all perſonal Quarrels and Reflections laid aſide, provided that you will procure us the priviledge of the *Preſs* in this particular. We may reaſonably hope that we ſhall not be denied in this; for elſe why do you in *Print* call on us for Information, and tell us, that your deſign in ſo doing, is not only to quiet your own Conſcience, but alſo *to provoke the Learned to offer ſuch Diſcourſes thereupon to the publick as may ſettle others*; beſides, it will be diſingenuous and baſe in *Carolus Alſton* to licenſe theſe *Hue and Cries* after us to vindicate our Cauſe, and yet not ſuffer us to *print* a line in anſwer to thoſe whom he licenſeth thus to call on us. But if after all we meet with a ſham, you muſt pardon me, if I plainly tell you, that I ſhall look on all your pretences as an artificial Contrivance, and an extraordinary Strain of of ſuperfine *Hypocriſie*, worthy of this more than *Phariſaical* Age: For what elſe can be the meaning of it, but to keep us in hand, and employ us in looking after I know not whom, whilſt your Book uncontradicted flies abroad, and not only miſrepreſents our Cauſe, but expoſeth us, as if we neither could nor would write in its behalf, being ſo ſolemnly called on. And there is this more to engage you to aſſiſt our Requeſt to the utmoſt, that if there be any errors in your Book, (as I am ſure there are ſome very groſs ones,) it will highly concern you, that Truth may with all ſpeed follow at the heels of it, to prevent, if poſſible, that miſchief which

otherwiſe it may do, and for which at the great day of Accounts you muſt in a great meaſure anſwer as the primary Cauſe and Author: But if we muſt be mock'd with Calls, whilſt it is intended that we ſhall never be ſuffered to return any Anſwer; you may juſtly expect, that if ever we can put the blind upon your *Watch-men*, we ſhall not only defend our *Cauſe*, but alſo expoſe their profound *Hypocriſy*, who like *Joab* kiſs and ſtab, and never pretend to be poſſeſſed with a fit of tenderneſs or kindneſs for us, but with a deſign to put a Cheat upon Mankind, and puſh on our utter Ruine and Deſtruction. *Sir*, Pray think of theſe things with due care, and let me have your Anſwer with ſpeed, and thereby you will much oblige,

Sir, Your unknown Friend

June 28. 1692. *and Servant,*

T. B.

An ADVERTISEMENT to the Reader.

The foregoing Letter *was ſent acording to the* Author's *direction and pretended requeſt, and therewith plain inſtructions how to return an Anſwer; but he not vouchſafing one ſyllable after two months waiting, I thought fit to ſend both this and the following* Letter *by the* Preſs, *ſeeing he would take no notice of the* Poſt.

The Second LETTER.

SIR,

YOur *Preface* ſavouring ſomething of a *Tender* and *Chriſtian Spirit*, made me read your little Tract with the greater care; but when I had throughly peruſed it, I not only found my expectation ſadly baffled, but ſtood amazed to ſee all the Marks and Tokens of a moſt Wicked and Malicious Deſign carried on under ſuch plauſible melting Pretences: If therefore you are not conſcious to your ſelf of any Inſincerity, it will concern you to vindicate your ſelf, by publiſhing an Ingenuous and Fair Anſwer to the following *Objections*, wherewith to me you ſeem juſtly chargeable.

And in the firſt place I cannot altogether acquit you Partiality and Unkindneſs in aſſigning the Names of the Speakers in your Dialogue: for not to concern my ſelf with Mr. *Eaſy* and Mr. *Troubleſome*, who chime ſo neatly

neatly under the *Greek* diſguiſe of *Dyſcheres* and *Eucheres*, that which I think I except againſt not without juſt cauſe, is, that you call one a *Conformiſt*, the other a *Recuſant*; now *Conformiſt* is in it ſelf an honeſt word, and of good reputation, and heretofore was uſed to ſignifie a perſon who approved and complied with the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church of *England*; but by it you plainly mean the Good Old Cauſe Men newly come again in faſhion, who have ſet aſide God's Commandments, and live in the open breach of them without the leaſt remorſe of Conſcience; who have not only departed from, but with all their might wickedly ſet themſelves againſt thoſe Doctrines, which the Church of *England* always valued as her Characteriſtical Mark, and for which ſhe was eſteemed all the World over; who have enervated her Diſcipline, made wicked additions to her Prayers, and attempted to make ſuch alterations, as would not leave her the ſame Church, if it could deſerve the Name of any; and though they failed to obtain this laſt by *Engliſh* Intereſt, yet they comfort themſelves with no ſmall hopes, that e're long they ſhall compaſs it by a *Sherlockian* Authority. Now ſome few years ſince we were accuſtomed to call ſuch Men as theſe *Conformiſts*; but if by *Conformiſts* you mean perſons that will comply with, or do any thing for baſe ends, then I ſhall not envy them the Title, and I think you may have beſtowed it on them not unfitly.

Then as to the Name *Recuſant*, you know it is moſt commonly applied to *Papiſts*, in which ſenſe it is as falſly as maliciouſly caſt upon us; and indeed if we either were *Papiſts*, or your Party did but ſo much as think us ſuch, they would uſe us better; for though the hideous Names of *Popery* and *Papiſts* be made uſe of to affright people, and to ſtir up the Mob barbarouſly to uſe ſome perſons, whoſe Innocence the Malice of wicked Politicians could not otherwiſe reach; yet I do not find, but that at preſent the perſons of *Papiſts* are acceptable enough, and in many places are not only protected, but courted and commended as very good *Subjects*, if not put into places of great Truſt: But then let the word *Recuſant* be taken in its full latitude for any ſort of Diſſenter, yet what is that to us? We firmly adhere to the *Liturgy*, the *Articles*, the *Canons*, and the true *Authority* of the *Church*; and I dare challenge your whole *Proteus* Crew, to tell us wherein we have ſtirred one ſtep from our old ground, or wherein we are changed from what we were? By what notion or figure are we called *Recuſants* for ſticking cloſe to that, for the departure from which others always were ſtiled *Recuſants*? Pray Sir! unriddle this; for I confeſs it paſſes my apprehenſion, if you are offended, that ſome Men cannot be induced to doat either on old *O.* or young *O.* or *O*'s Nephew, yet what is that to the purpoſe? How comes that to be a Mark of *Recuſancy*, which heretofore was thought to be an evident note of the contrary? The Name is ſlanderouſly caſt upon us, and an ingenuous Man will think himſelf bound to make what ſatisfaction

tisfaction he can, both for the ill Name he hath unjuſtly given us, and for transferring (what in him lies) our right by the Name he hath given to our Adverſaries.

I ſhall now briefly examine the Treatiſe it ſelf: And though it may not be worth my while to ranſack it in every part of it; yet I do not intend to omit any thing very conſiderable, and I will uſe my beſt endeavour not to miſtake your ſenſe; and when I have made my Remarks, if you can after ſuch pretences clear your ſincerity, or acquit your ſelf from being engaged with others in a deſign utterly to ruine thoſe who have ſuffered ſo much already, or can maintain their Cauſe againſt us, I ſhall be willing to find my ſelf diſappointed the beſt way, and not reject any reaſonable Conviction.

But before I enter upon a particular Examination, I cannot forbear to lay before you ſome things in general, wherein I could wiſh ſuch a Maſter of Language as your ſelf had been guilty of leſs ingenuity, and not put tricks upon us, whilſt you make all imaginable pretences of Tenderneſs and fair Play. For,

Firſt, The *Objections* on our part you rarely repreſent either fully or fairly, and often deliver them clouded with ſuch Flouriſhes of Rhetorick, or mask'd with ſuch Cant unproper for a Diſpute, that it is not eaſy for the Reader to diſcern wherein their main ſtrength and force lies; and you that could ſay for the contrary Cauſe more than it deſerves, or will bear, ought at leaſt to have done us common Juſtice.

Secondly, When you come to Anſwer the *Objections* thus weakly propoſed, ſometimes you plainly ſham them, ſometimes you dexterouſly ſteal away your Reader, and carry him off to another thing, and ſometimes you grant what is not to be granted. Now this is not to argue our Caſe, but to betray our Cauſe; and any indifferent perſon, that ſhall obſerve the whole contexture, will ſcarce be able to free himſelf from a ſuſpicion, that there was ſome ſuch deſign in it.

Thirdly, You in downright terms ſhamelefly ſlander and bely our Suffering Biſhops and Clergy, and that to this very end and purpoſe, that you might ſtab their Cauſe, and either furniſh their Adverſaries with new *Objections*, or give a greater force to others, than indeed they had. And I think this ſo far from being fair, that it is not honeſt dealing, and therefore is ſo very unbecoming a perſon of that Sincerity and Indifferency which you pretend to; that if you take not up ſome better courſe to ſecure your beloved Character, every one will ſee through the thin frail Diſguiſe, and diſcover the Wolf in the Sheep's Cloathing.

Fourthly, When Arguments fail you, you ſmartly ſtir up the Government againſt us, and not content with the great Loſſes and the hard Circumſtances we are under, you move for an utter Extirpation; as if the only way to confute the Cauſe, were by a Maſſacre of the Perſons: Such a thing I have read of in *France*, and *Ireland*; but did never think that I

ſhould

ſhould have lived in ſuch Helliſh times, as to ſee any Engliſh Man encourage it. I do not well know what Men or Devils could deviſe more; but for a Man, who profeſſeth himſelf doubtfull of the Cauſe, who would ſeem ſo conſciencious, as to prepare himſelf to ſuffer with us; who talkt of being ſo full of bowels of Compaſſion for us; who values himſelf for his Sincerity and Reſolution to part with all for Truth; I ſay, for this Man at the ſame time ſlily to plead for the utmoſt Cruelty and Barbarity that can be executed upon us, is certainly ſuch a ſurprizing unheard of ſtrain of Hypocriſy, as was never thought on, till this demure but worſt of times, wherein the Devil continually walks up and down like an Angel of Light, and the moſt wicked work of Hell is done under pretence of the ſervice of Heaven: But that I may not ſeem to ſay theſe things *gratis*, I ſhall now come to the particular Examination of your Treatiſe.

The Quarrel begins about Faſting and Feaſting, and *Dyſcheres* had as good have accepted your Invitation, as to be ſo ill treated for the Refuſal, though to me you ſeem to make a very good excuſe for him; *That it was their Faſt-day, wherein they did ſolemnly humble themſelves before God, to reverſe his diſpleaſure, provoked by the deplorable Diſloyalty and Schiſm of the Nation, in rejecting the true King and ſincere Biſhops and Clergy for their bounden Conſcience and Loyalty*, &c. (p. 1.) Any Man may eaſily perceive the malice of this ſly Inſinuation. Whether any ſuch days are obſerved I know not; but if there be not, I wiſh there were, and the oftner the better. For to my apprehenſion ſuch are the crying ſins of the Nation, that ſcarce any Repentance can be deep enough, nor any Teſtification of it too ſolemn or too frequent: But, good Sir! Why may we not humble our ſelves before God for the ſins of the Nation? To this you anſwer like the Man whom the Satyr thought not fit to truſt in his company, becauſe he blew hot and cold with the ſame breath; for you are glad and ſorry at the ſame time; but the compoſition I find is not ſo ſtrong, but that your Joy preſently overcomes your Sorrow, and makes it quite vaniſh. You tell us, *That you heartily bewail all the Evils that have happened in this Nation on occaſion of this great Revolution*, (p. 1.) And I wiſh you ſay true, you are ſo quickly again upon the merry pin, for you tell us immediately, *That we are obliged to ſing the Songs of Sion*; and you give us this reaſon, *That the goodneſs of God hath not been ceſſant, but out of the Evils of theſe times hath produced a moſt eminent Good*; and leſt we ſhould be at a loſs to know what it is, you tell us, *That it is the redemption of his own* (i. e. God's) *People, and faithfull Children, and this endangered Church from the Inundations of Popery and Bondage*. But againſt this I have two ſmall *Objections*, 1. That the latter of theſe is notoriouſly falſe. 2. Suppoſing God out of a Miracle of his Mercy to have done ſuch a thing, yet that will not juſtifie either you or any other Men in your ſins; and conſequently all you ſay is no Anſwer to the *Objection*,

jection, which you had put into *Dyſcheres*'s Mouth, That a good Chriſtian may ſet a part a time to humble himſelf for the crying ſins of the Nation, and keep it too, though others at the ſame time, like *Job*'s Children, go to their Feaſting: But let us bring your metal to the Touch-ſtone, and try whether your *Redemption* be currant Coin, or only falſe ſtuff waſhed over. The Complement of *God*'s *own People and faithful Children*, I ſuppoſe you intended for *your Conformiſts*, but if you had not concealed from the World, that thoſe *faithful Children* were a parcel of forſworn wretches, who had forſaken the Principles of their Church, and the Commandments of their God; I doubt, an indifferent perſon would have made it a queſtion, whether God would own all thoſe for his Children, whom you lay to him? And for your own ſake let me give you this advice, That before you ſet up your Trade of Canonizing, you will conſider what is denounced againſt thoſe, who *call Evil Good and Good Evil*. But pray Sir! Wherein conſiſts this *Redemption of this endangered Church from Popery and Slavery?* If by the Church you mean thoſe that ſtick to the Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Principles of it, all thoſe Clergy are driven from their Churches, and deprived of their Eſtates, not ſo much being left to keep them from ſtarving, as was allowed by their ſworn Enemies, the *Rump* and their Sequeſtrators; ſo much a *Dutch* Mercy exceeds even an *Engliſh* Rebel's! And farther, when all others have their Liberty, they alone are not ſuffered to ſerve God; but if they do meet together, the Hell-Hounds which are ſet to hunt them, ſeize the Perſons, and then the Auditors are plagu'd with Oaths, and the Miniſter committed to *Newgate*, or ſome filthy Priſon for high Miſdemeanor, perhaps for high Treaſon, and then he certainly continues in *Limbo* for two Terms, though he were as innocent as an Apoſtle; and all to this end, that he may be utterly undone, and that ill uſage and the ſtink of a Gaol might poyſon him, whom they have not pretences enough otherways to murder. If this be *Redemption from Bondage*, I wiſh you had kept it for your Friends: But to deal plainly with you, I think there was a time, when we might have rejoiced in ſome ſuch *Redemption* as you ſpeak of; for whatever deſigns King *James* had in his Head, or was put upon; it is certain, that the reſolution of the Church of *England* had not only baffled them all, but made him lay aſide the thoughts of them; nay things were at that paſs, that he would rely only on their Loyalty, whereby it was put into their power, not only to have advanced the Reputation of our Church above all others, but to have given a greater blow to the Papiſts, than they have hitherto received; but inſtead of that a parcel of *Laditudinarian Canary Birds* betrayed their King and the Church, ſet up a Schiſmatical Authority againſt the True, changed the laudable Principles of the Church of *England*, for the worſt of Tenets they could find, either amongſt the looſeſt Jeſuits, or the rankeſt democratical Rebels,

and

and have hurled all into ſuch a wild confuſion, that every thing that can be dear to us, is in danger, and we have now more reaſon to fear Popery than ever; and I am apt to think, that if ever things come to that paſs, thoſe Religious Weather-Cocks, who now make ſuch a fearfull out-cry againſt it, would then be the moſt forward Men to help it in: for what ſhould hinder, when they have already taken up ſeveral Papiſts Principles to defend their preſent practice, and given us a plain inſtance that their Conſcience will ſtretch to any thing that will ſecure their Preferment. But after all, notwithſtanding your great pretence of Kindneſs to us, I am apt to think, that by the *Church*, you mean only your own *Conformiſts*, as you call them: But, Sir! Till you can acquit them from Schiſm, (which proves too hard a task for you,) you ſhould not call them the Church of *England*, of which they ſcarce hold any thing but the Revenues; and have not only departed from her moſt ſignal Conſtitutions, but are contriving daily to get farther from them. In the Language of the Fathers, the Intruder into another's See is always called an Adulterer; ſuch a one there is croſs the water, who can tell you with whom he not long ſince Treated, and by whoſe order. Would it not make a fine Church of *England* to ſee the ſeveral Sectaries taken in by virtue of an Act of Comprehenſion? Oh! But this is to enlarge the Bounds, and preſerve the Brethren. Is it ſo? But if a Man ſhould tell me, that he laid Fire-brands together to preſerve them, I ſhould be afraid, that it would only make them burn more fiercely, and conſume more ſpeedily; indeed if he could do by them as Painters, who grind ſeveral Colours together, ſomething might come of it; but then it would be ſuch a ſomething as was not before; the old Church of *England* it could not be: But the thing is ſtill worſe, and there are ſome at this time, who are ſtark mad to put thoſe things together, whoſe natures will not ſuffer them to mingle; and you may as well try to incorporate Oyl and Water, which though you may ſeem to have jumbled together for a while, yet in a ſhort time they ſeparate of themſelves; and thus it will be with your Sects coupled together, who can never truly unite, unleſs one or both change their nature. Now what will be the effect of theſe Mountebank tricks, and playing the Empericks with Religion, who can divine? The Downfall of the Church of *England* (unleſs God intervene) any one may eaſily ſee; but what ſhall follow, whether Confuſion, Atheiſm, Popery, or what elſe, is not ſo eaſie to gueſs. Now, Sir! If you can without diſſembling call this *The Redemption of an endangered Church from Bondage and Popery*, you are either a Man of ſuch odd Intellectuals, or ſuch infatuated Apprehenſions as nothing but this Age has produced, wherein too many have got the conqueſt both of their Senſes and their Reaſon, and in ſpight of all Argument will plainly tell you, that they will or will not believe but what they liſt. But yet here I muſt requeſt not to be miſtaken: I am not an Enemy to every

Man, that is not of my Perſuaſion; nor do I envy any Man the Liberty which Authority ſhall allow him; but I am ſtrangely miſtaken, if it be ſo much as poſſible to imbody thoſe ſeveral ſorts of Men into the Church: What there may be in Toleration, or how far it may be granted, I diſpute not, but leave it to my Superiors; but however Men may delude themſelves with vain fancies, I boldly affirm, that the project of Comprehenſion is impracticable. Sir, Pardon this ſmall Digreſſion, and I will now return to you again; and if what you ſay were as true as it is falſe, would you make that uſe of it to encourage Men in their ſins? If God bring Light out of Darkneſs, will that juſtifie us in our iniquities? Or does God ſtand in need of our ſins, as if without them he could not produce ſome great good for us? Or are we therefore to rejoice in them, becauſe God hath done great things for us nothwithſtanding ſuch Provocations? The Apoſtle ſure was of another mind, who tells us, That *the goodneſs and long ſufferance of God calls us to repentance*; and if God at any time continue his Mercies notwithſtanding the crying ſins of a People; it is then high time for them to repent in Sackcloath and Aſhes, leſt they ſin away his Mercies, and convert his Patience into Fury: And if you pleaſe to conſider the matter better, it is not unlikely, that you may judge this to be too much our Caſe.

I confeſs you ſuffer *Dyſcheres* to ſpeak ſome truth, when he ſaith, *That the preſent State is worſe than a deluge of Popery; for then the Church would have ſaved her Integrity, though not her Eaſe; now the Daughter of Sion is become an Harlot, the generality of her Children apoſtate and unchurched, and the Faith and Communion with the few*, &c. (p. 22.) But when you your ſelf had made him ſpeak thus, and nothing but truth, you preſently ſham it off, ſtiling it *a wild-fire Zeal, and fit of Fury*. And thus you may eaſily anſwer any thing by giving it ill names; but then *your Submiſſion to the preſent Conſtitution* you think to be ſo far from effecting this, that you now queſtion, *whether it can be proved a ſin?* And truly if the breaking a lawfull Oath, and taking an unlawfull one; if the witholding the Right from one, and the giving of that which is none of their own to another; if the overthrowing the Conſtitution of the Kingdom, and violating the Laws of God be no ſin, you have made an excellent diſcovery, and done a leud Age a great kindneſs, who need nothing more, than that there could be no ſin at all; and at this rate it will be a hard matter to find any: But then you farther ſay, that *if you ſhould admit it to be a ſin, yea a crying ſin*, yet it doth not *unchurch you*: But, Sir! If it be *a ſin, and a crying ſin*, I think it calls for your repentance, and you ought not to perſevere in it, as you plainly do. But however you ſay, *That it is not every ſuch ſin that doth unchurch ſingle perſons, or publick Societies*; nor did I ever know any body that ſaid ſo: But here the word *unchurch* is unuſually and capriciouſly put; for the word Church is an equivocal term, and variouſly uſed; for we often

ſpeak

ſpeak of *Schiſmatical Churches*, and you may have heard of the *Synagogue* of *Satan*, of which if any Man have a mind to be a Member, I do not deſire to be one of his Society. And after all, though every ſin do not *unchurch*, yet there are ſuch ſins as exclude Men out of the true Church, and put them into ſuch a ſtate, that ſincere Chriſtians ought not to join in Communion with them; and if you pleaſe to take the pains, you will find it to be the unanimous Judgment of the Fathers and Primitive Chriſtians, that the ſetting up Antibiſhops, the erecting Altar againſt Altar, and the adhering to the Uſurpers and Intruders, againſt thoſe who had the true Canonical Authority, did put Men into a ſtate of Schiſm, and make it unlawfull for other Chriſtians to join in Communion with them. St. *Cyprian* ſays of every ſuch Biſhop, that he is not *ſecundus*, but *nullus*; nay, they accounted not only theſe perſons, but all that joined with them, as Schiſmaticks, and cut off from the Church, as is plain from the Caſe of *Marcian* of *Arles*, who joined with *Novatian*. And this is the very Caſe, and your very ſin; waſh your hands of it, if you can; though if it were neceſſary, I could farther prove what you ſeem to require, *That the Principles of Doctrine and Opinion, whence theſe ſins receive encouragement, are ſuch as deſtory the Church's Fundamentals and Structure*, if ſuch Principles which deſtroy all Morals, and all Faith and Truth amongſt Men, can be ſaid to do it. You would do well to explain what you mean, when you ſay, *That an Authentick Act muſt paſs in order to a ſtate of actual Expulſion*: For Men may exclude themſelves, as well as be excluded by others; and may depart and run away from a Church, as well as be thrown out of it; and their act ſhall be too Authentick, if by it you mean valid. Your inſtance of the *Roman Church* is inſignificant; for you know we do not communicate with it: But that of the *Eaſtern Churches* is ſtill leſs to the purpoſe; for I am not ſatisfied that either they have condemned us, or we them as Schiſmaticks; I am ſure Dr. *Baſter* tells us, *That ſome of the Greek Clergy deſired him not only to communicate, but to exerciſe his Miniſtry among them*, nor did he refuſe it; nor have I heard any others make any great complaint of their unkindneſs in this matter.

In the next place, when you ſhould introduce *Dyſcheres* to defend us, you make him ſtate the matter ſo weakly, as to betray our Cauſe: For why ſhould he *admit, that you are not unchurched* (it is the word you will uſe) *for want of an Eccleſiaſtical Judge?* (p. 2) I do not know that we want an Eccleſiaſtical Judge; our Metropolitane, with his Suffragans, are a ſufficient and proper Judge; and if they have not *lata Sententia*, (which there may be great reaſon to forbear,) yet in *praxi* their Judgments are ſufficiently declared; and not to mention other of your Biſhops, even that graceful Hypocrite who is mounted into his place, by his Canonical Oath owes obedience to him whom he hath ſo unworthily betray'd. But ſuppoſe we ſhould want a Judge to your mind, yet you

may be actually excluded; and in case of erecting Altar against Altar, the Canons *ipso facto* exclude you, and they make not only the Clergy, but every Christian in this case to be so far a Judge, as to avoid all Communion with such; and that this is your Case you have been told again and again; but you are much like some Men, who are or pretend to be thick of hearing, who can understand any thing that makes for them, before the words are well out of a Man's Mouth; but if any thing unprofitable or pinching be spoken, they are as deaf as a Beetle. But farther, it is not fair to make the true cause of the Breach to be *only danger*; for it is not meer *danger* for which we break either with you or *Rome*; it is not because there is danger in the Communion (for that possibly might be avoided) but because the sin is unavoidable in it. And still it is less ingenuous to call it a *Secession* on our part, for we are the very same persons we were; we stick to the same Principles, we own the same Ecclesiastical Authority; but you have forsaken both, and I think such make the *Secession*. Nor can I imagine why you, who have renounced both the Doctrines and Authority of the Church of *England*, should charge us with a *Secession*, unless it be, that you have driven us from our Churches, and robb'd us of our Livelihoods: But in this case we have the most Eminent Fathers of God's Church for our Precedents, who never thought their Cause the worse, because others were more than ordinary unmerciful and maliciously bent against them.

When you had thus unfairly stated the case, you bring in your Champion *Encheres* making such an answer, as is enough to pull off the Visor, and lay open all your Hypocrisie. For (saith he) *Though our Church* (and I desire to know what Church that is) *justly and absolutely rejects the* Roman *Monarchy, yet she will not refuse any lawfull Communion or Correspondence with it, in any good Ecclesiastical Negotiations consistent with Integrity, saving still a publick remonstrance to all her Pollutions*, (p. 3.) What can be the meaning of this, but that *your Church* is ready and willing to join in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, as many of your Brethren take the Oaths, *i. e.* with a Declaration? Sir! Though this may be a kind of surprize to some of your squeamish Disciples; yet I tell you plainly, that though you endeavour to entangle and make intricate the sense with superfluous words, this and no other can be your meaning; for your Argument and Parallel is insignificant and senseless, if this be not your purpose: For thus it follows, *so you should communicate with us in all that is lawfull.* Now it is an actual Communion in all publick Worship and Offices, which you require from us; and the reason you give why we should pay it, is in the words before cited, the sense of which must be, that your Church is ready with *a Remonstrance* to afford the same Communion to the *Church* of *Rome*, and therefore we ought not to deny it to you, who take your selves to be a *Church* much less liable to exceptions. If therefore your Argument be of any force, you must mean,

that

that *your Church* is ready to afford the ſame Communion which you require of us, and that is actual Communion in publick Worſhip. Now I deſire all ſincere Chriſtians to take notice of this; here are a parcel of Men, who for their Preaching, and Praying, and ſeeming Zeal, and Mortification, have been idolized by many good People, who have bellowed againſt Popery, till they have frighted People out of their wits, till they had prepared them to rob any Man's Houſe, or cut his Throat, whom they gave out to be a Papiſt or Popiſhly affected; nay, till they had perſuaded them to drive away the lawfull King for being a Papiſt, and yet here in effect they tell you, that all this was trick, an Art to lead People by the Noſe, and meer damn'd Hypocriſie. For Popery is no ſuch dreadfull thing to them, but that with an inſignificant Remonſtrance they can go to *Maſs*, and are as willing to do it, as they are deſirous we ſhould come to Prayers with them; nay, it is their Argument to perſuade us, that we may and ought to communicate with them, becauſe they think it lawfull to communicate with the *Roman*, *i. e.* as they think a more polluted *Church*; and this is laid down not as the ſingle Opinion of the Author, but as the ſenſe of their *Church*. Good People! theſe are your Zealots againſt Popery. Pray who betrays the Reformation now? If we ſhould be in danger of Popery, do not you think theſe your Idols would ſtand like Bullwarks and Mountains againſt it, who you ſee declare, even when they have no temptation, that they are now ready to meet it more than half way; It is an unlucky thing, Sir, that you ſhould make this diſcovery, not only for your ſelf, but in the Name of your *Church*; it is enough to take off the confidence the Saints have had in you, and to make all perſons who are not reſolved to blind themſelves, that they may be deluded, to look on you as a parcel of deep and demure, yet fullſome and pernicious Hypocrites. What you add, *That if you do amiſs, it is through ſimplicity and want of underſtanding, which we might eaſilier heal by accommodation, &c.* is ſuch a condeſcending ſtrain of Diſſimulation, that I am afraid you are unwilling to be taken at your word; for if another ſhould tell you, which is the ſame thing, that you are a parcel of ſilly weak fellows, who are not to be truſted with the management of Affairs, but ought to be governed by wiſer Heads, I am confident you would ſpit in his Face, if you did not incenſe the enraged Mob to knock out his Brains: But though this be a particular ſetch to make eaſie People believe you to be a ſort of moſt humble mortified Men, yet ſome Men's actions have long ſince convinced me, that they had rather be real Knaves, than ſo much as miſtaken for Fools; and it is clear as noon day, that thoſe perſons, who (you ſay) want Underſtanding, have for many years either palm'd, curb'd and kept under, or deluded and abuſed, and now at laſt have undone all that would not ſubmit to their Underſtandings, and truckle under them; and indeed all the Knavery of the *Rump* and *Oliverian* days, is meer

indigeſted

indigeſted ſtuff compared with thoſe moſt Artificial Cheats, which ſome of your Maſters of Hypocriſie, thoſe humble ſimple Creatures, (as you would perſuade us,) have ſhewn in our days. When you pleaſe to call on me, and procure me liberty to anſwer, I will give you inſtances.

But when *Dyſcheres* had reliped to your deſires *of Accommodation, that there was now no more hope, becauſe you have broken the eſſential bonds of Eccleſiaſtical Communion, and begun the Schiſm in admitting Intruders*, &c. Your Friend *Eucheres* makes anſwer by way of conceſſion, *that if their* (i. e. our Biſhops and Clergy) *ejection was only for adhering to the Doctrines of this Church, or to the Laws of God, then they are perſecuted by the Church as well as the State.* (p. 3.) But, Sir! What if neither the Laws of God, nor the Church had been concerned, and they had had only occaſion to ſtand the Laws and Conſtitutions of the Land, which under no pretence whatſoever allows the Subject to uſe any force againſt the lawfull Sovereign, much leſs to Depoſe him; and in caſe he die or relinquiniſh, yet ſuffer no injury to be to the next Heir, but proclaim him to be, without the help of any Ceremony or Formality, immediately King, in the very firſt moment of the vacancy, as admitting no *Interregnum*? I think this had been no ill cauſe. But then farther, ſuppoſe none of theſe conſented, and that the matter only was *coram non judice*, and they were ejected by thoſe who had nothing to do with them; with your leave, Sir, I do not think my ſelf bound to ratifie the iniquity of ſuch proceedings: But ſince you have aſſumed the Authority to aſſign what Cauſes you pleaſe, I will ſtick to thoſe you have named, *i. e. The adhering to the Doctrines of the Church, and the Laws of God.* And what then, Sir? Why then you ſay, *this will require a very clear proof.* But pray, Sir! Who are they that ought to bring this *clear proof?* I have heard ſome ſay, that it is an Axiome in Law, *That they who expect the benefit, ought to make the proof.* Now you get all into your hands, and would you give no reaſon for it? The *Meridian Sun* is not more clear, than that King *James* poſſeſſed His Crown by an undoubted Right; and the ejected Clergy held their Sees and other Charges by an unqueſtionable Title, whether you have reſpect to the Laws of the Church or the Land; when therefore you diſpoſſeſs them of ſuch manifeſt acknowledged Right, you ought to bring, if poſſible, more clear and demonſtrable proofs for your proceedings; otherwiſe all reaſonable Men ought to condemn you for your bold and barbarous injuſtice; ſo that this *clear proof* you call for, ought to be on your ſide. If a Thief rob me of my Goods, it were very unreaſonable to leave me no other remedy, than the producing ſuch reaſons to him, as ſhould prevail with him to reſtore them again: For perhaps he would not hear me; or if he did, it would be but to mock me; for though my proofs were never ſo clear, yet 'tis ten thouſand to one, that he would never own them to be ſo;

yet

yet much at this rate you deal with us, and which is worſe, you make our Plea for us, and ſuffer us not to ſpeak but as you pleaſe: But ſince it muſt be ſo, I'll follow you in the courſe you take, though a very unreaſonable task.

You ſeem to grant, *That our Church teacheth us to preſerve an untainted Loyalty to our Lawfull Sovereigns, which with us come in by Inheritance; and that accordingly our Oath of Allegiance binds us to the King, his Heirs, and Lawfull Succeſſors.* And you might have told us ſeveral other things, which this Church teacheth us, *viz.* Canonical Obedience to our Spiritual Fathers; the indiſpenſable Duty of Children to Parents, whenever they command it, or their condition requires it; the not running with a multitude to do evil, nor the encouraging other Men in their wickedneſs: In ſhort, whatever the ſacred word of God, or the reverend Conſtitutions of his *Church* requires from us. But to omit theſe things, which are ſo apt to gather the Tares of Schiſmaticks and Rebels, I ſhall examin what you ſay to your own Propoſals. *An untainted Loyalty* you approve, *while the Obligation laſts*; and we deſire no more: But then you think this Obligation may ceaſe, not only by *Death*, or *Reſignation*, but alſo by *Ceſſion*; nor do I think it worth while to diſpute this with you, provided it be real, not forced, nor falſly imputed: For ſo any Man that is driven out of his Houſe, or takes a journey from home, may be interpreted to have quitted his Eſtate by *Ceſſion*: But when *Ceſſion* is real (which is very rare) it can effect only the Party who makes it, and ought to be no injury to the next Heir, and in our particular caſe our Conſtitutions will not ſuffer it. But after all, the main aſſertion is ſuch an impudent falſhood, as nothing but a perſon bewitch'd with Rebellion would offer: For has that perſon made a *Ceſſion*, who though, to perſerve his life, he fly from Fraud and irreſiſtable Force, yet all the while claims his Right, calls on all perſons to do him juſtice, and uſeth all honeſt means that may be to recover his Right? At this rate every Man would have made a *Ceſſion* who ſuffers wrong, though he beſtir himſelf all he can to do himſelf Right: But, ſay you, *This was ſuch a Ceſſion, as the States in Convention judged a virtual Abdication of the Sovereignty*; *and of this*, you add, *they were the moſt Competent, Authentick, and Final Judges*; *and this*, you tell us, *we are to ſubmit to, becauſe the Kingdom hath ratified thoſe proceedings in a ſecond Parliament.* Now not to complain of unrighteous Judgment, though there was never more cauſe; the Anſwer I ſhall return is, That they were neither *Competent*, *Authentick*, nor *Final Judges*. *Competent* they could not be, who for the prevailing part of them were either actually in the Conſpiracy againſt him, or joined with the Conſpirators, and refuſed ſo much as to read his Letters, or hear any Meſſage from him: Nor could they be *Authentick Judges*, who had no Law to authorize either them or their Proceedings; nor did I ever hear, that the natural Subjects of a Sovereign Monarch could be his *Authentick Judges*,

Judges, unleſs from Preſident *Bradſhaw*, the *Regicides* and their Adherents: And if upon this ſcore you will have the proceedings valid againſt the Son, you muſt alſo juſtifie the barbarous Murder of the Father. And then they could not be *final Judges*; becauſe being neither *Competent*, nor *Authentick Judges*, they were no proper Judges at all. Nor doth it all help the matter, that you call theſe *your Judges*, the *Eſtates*; and farther to countenance the matter, place them in *Convention*: For how are they *Eſtates*, but with reſpect to the King and Conſtitution? Which if they overthrow, pray what becomes of their *Eſtateſhips?* It is the King made them ſuch, and they are ſo with Subordination to him; nor is their *Convention* any thing without him; they cannot convene without his Writ. You might have remembred, that your Oracle Dr. *B* —— tells you, that ſingle defect makes an *eſſential Nullity*: if they do convene, they can only act by and under the King's Authority; and when they are come to a reſolution, and have concluded upon any thing, ſtill all ſinks again into nothing, unleſs it be *ratified* with the *Royal Aſſent*. Thus without the King your *Eſtates* are inſignificant, but againſt him our Law condemns them as Rebels, and thoſe of all others are the moſt unfit perſons to make the *only Competent*, *Authentick*, *and Final Judges* of the moſt Fundamental part of our Conſtitutions. Did ever Men make them Judges of the Law, who are condemned by the Law? This is to pull the Judge from the Bench, and ſet up the Offender from the Bar. Nor will it afford you any relief, that *theſe proceedings were ratified by a ſecond Parliament*, which had never a *firſt*. For as for your *Tranſubſtantiating Convention*, which would have perſuaded us, that by a certain *Hocus Pocus* trick they were *Metamorphis'd* into a *Parliament*; you ſee plainly, that they were no better than a *Riotous Aſſembly*, whoſe tranſactions were in themſelves null and void, as being contrary to Law, and cenſurable by Law; And therefore your ſecond-firſt-no Parliament, which your Riotous *Convention* laid, could have no more Authority than that was able to give; and that was none at all; for *nil dat quod non habet*, nor can the Effect be greater than the Cauſe. What ſignifies their Ratification who had no Authority, but from thoſe whom they ratifie, and thoſe whom they ratifie had none to give? Your *Second* therefore, Sir, is as good as your *Firſt*, and both good for nothing at all; and if you ſhould go and put ten thouſand nothings together, ſtill all will amount to juſt nothing. But to ſecure this your weak, or rather wicked Plea againſt a juſt *Objection*, obvious to every Eye, you add, *That though King* JAMES *abroad condemns them, yet that is no argument either that they were unjuſt or inauthoritative.* No! But pray Sir why not? Can you thus eaſily puff away the Right of Kings with a breath; Is your bare aſſertion without reaſon ſufficient to overthrow him? Was he not their King? Were they not his Subjects? Did he complain of any thing but wrong done him? Did he demand any thing

but

but his own? Might not he call upon his Subjects, in whoſe power it was, and whoſe duty it was, to reſtore him? Can ſuch a modeſt, moderate, tender-hearted Man as your ſelf, thus ſlight and inſult over a diſtreſſed Prince? Or, when all other Men are allowed to keep, or claim, or recover their right, was he, poor Man, alone born odd, that whatever he does or ſays muſt ſignify nothing? This is cold comfort for a baniſhed Prince; but I hope others will not prove ſo hard hearted to him. But you proceed thus, *When a King is fled from his Throne into Foreign Dominions, or doth not exert any Royal Power or Preſence to his People, the Eſtates of this Land are the Supreme Domeſtick Judges upon the Tenure of the Sovereignty.* At this rate it will be good for Kings to keep *exerting their Power*; for if they ſhould but chance to ſleep, or fall ſo ſick as for a time to incapacitate them for buſineſs, the Eſtates, if they pleaſe, may alter the Tenure, or diſpoſe of it to another. But, pray Sir, Anſwer me two Queſtions: Firſt, Who made your Eſtates Judges? Secondly, Whether I am bound to follow their Judgment, againſt manifeſt right and my known duty? But after all, this is a moſt malicious inſinuation againſt your ſuffering King, as if he ran away through wantonneſs, and would have nothing to do with us, but had quite forſaken his People; whenas you very well know, that he exerts all the Power he can; that he doth not more is not his fault, but yours: You may have both his Power and his Preſence too among you, if you pleaſe; But will you, contrary to your Duty and Oaths, keep him out by force of Arms, and then plead your own wickedneſs in your defence? I did hope for more Ingenuity from ſuch a Pretender to Modeſty: But you will not allow us *to deny the Authority by which they* (*i. e.* your Eſtates) *ſate; for by what Authority* (ſay you) *was that Free Parliament called, or ſate, that voted in King* Charles *the Second?* Sir, if you pleaſe, let another be called, and Vote in King *JAMES* the Second; when things are out of order, and Good Men ſet them to rights again, I do not think any honeſt Man will oppoſe it upon the ſcore of ſome ſmall niceties; but when Subjects rebel againſt their Prince, and drive him away, and make that the ground of their going on, and doing farther wickedneſs, I cannot underſtand the Authority of this There is certainly in every Man an innate natural Power and Authority to wiſh well to and vote for Right; by virtue of this, when things were in confuſion, the Subjects of King *Charles* the Second, returning to their Wits and Allegiance, ſend a convenient number to act for the whole, who recal their rightful King; and if you ſhould do ſo likewiſe, I ſhould not be very quarreliſome with you; but whatever Name they might give it, to put a better gloſs upon the thing, they were no Parliament, till King *Charles* made them ſo; for he, their lawful King, by an Act in a legal Parliament, might ſtamp on them that Character, and give them that Authority and Force, which they had not before; and thus ſeveral of their Acts might become Laws, by

virtue of that after-ratification, not by any force of their own; but as for calling back the King, that was not making any new Law, but enforcing the old; and was not so much an Act of Authority, as Obedience and Duty; and if you could find out the same way, you would be the best Friends both to your Country and your selves. You tell us, *That it is prodigious peevishness to require a King's Presence, or Commission, when he is gone, and hath left all in Anarchy.* I hope, Sir, you do not think, that I require a King to be present, when he is absent; and then, with your good leave, I think it no such peevishness to act by his Commission in his absence; but that it is rather a thing, which (if it can be had) ought to be done, and in all regular times was done: *Richard* the First was ingaged in the *Holy War*, when his Father died; so that he was far enough from his *Throne*, and unable to *exert any Royal Power or Presence to his People*; and to make the matter worse, in his return he was taken prisoner, and detained in *Germany*: In this case, had you been one of the *Estates*, you would have been for setting up another King, that would *exert his Royal Power or Presence to his People*; but they had another sense of their duty; they mourned under the common Calamity, caused all proceedings to pass under his Name and Authority, and stretch'd their purses to the purpose to redeem him, and bring him home: But you drive your *King* from home, when you have him; and when he would return to *exert his Royal Power and Presence*, you will not suffer it; but keep him out with your Swords in your Hands; and these rebellious Actions you make Precedents to warrant all the Mischief you have, or would do; and after all you would perswade us, that you are a parcel of guiltless, humble, modest, conscientious Creatures: *Clamat Melicerta periisse frontem de rebus.* At last to help a lame dog over a style, you say, *The Estates of any Nation, being invited by a victorious and unresisted Power, may come together and treat with him that thus calls them, though he hath not antecedent Authority (strictly taken) to call them.* Here is a pretty fetch in the word *unresisted Power*; for irresistable he knew it was not; and if it was unresisted, whose fault was that? May they refuse to resist an invading power, when they are able? And may they make that disobedience the reason of their compliance with him, and casting off their own Sovereign? But if, without daubing, you had put the case as it was, it ought to run thus: The Estates of any Nation, or the Natural Subjects of any Sovereign *Prince*, may combine with, and invite in a Foreign *Prince*; and when he comes, though with a contemptible force, they may forsake their lawful *Prince*; and then by their treachery, having left him helpless and hopeless, may treat with the Foreigner, drive away their own King, give his Crown to the Foreigner, and maintain it with their Swords and *Purses*, without which he could not keep his ill-gotten Goods: But I suppose it was your modesty, which made you disguise this true proposal of the matter; because so plainly set down

down, it would not well bear the light. That the Church's Loyalty, as to the Object, is to be guided by the true conſtitution of the State, I deny not; but I ſhall never yield, what you would thence ſlurr upon us, That it is to follow every *Civil Judgment*; much leſs the uncivil Judgment of any Sett of Conſpirators and Traytors, into whoſe Hands you ſo liberally and piouſly diſpoſe it.

When you had thus looſely argued, you introduce *Dyſcheres* in our behalf, yielding to your Plea; (*p.*4.) but you ſee it is one thing for a Man to ſpeak for himſelf, and another thing for another to ſpeak for him; for you may perceive, that I am not of the ſame mind, for which I have given you ſome Reaſons, which I hope you will anſwer, or not for the future conclude that we have yielded the Cauſe: It was more than belonged to you to take upon you to plead our Cauſe; but to give it away and betray it, is too much; but to do it in ſuch a manner, that it might ſeem done by our ſelves, and that all perſons might believe we had given up the Cauſe, looks like a deſigned piece of knavery. But, Sir, if you had no power to beſtow, what you have ſo prodigally given away, and the Reaſons I have produced againſt it be valid, then you ought to remember, that all your following diſcourſe is inſignificant and vain, as being built upon a falſe Foundation: But let that paſs, and let us ſee what you will allow to be ſaid in our caſe; and it is this, *How could they* (*i. e.* your Eſtates) *pervert the hereditary law and rule of Succeſſion, that is fundamental to this Crown?* To this you Anſwer, *That the general and ordinary rule of Succeſſion to this Crown is hereditary, but in extraordinary Interruptions and Convulſions of State againſt the ordinary courſe, our Laws and Conſtitutions do allow the Eſtates ſuch a King as can be actually had for the time being, till the ordinary rule can be fairly recovered.* Now if a Man were to ſpeak this in plain *Engliſh*, it would be thus: By our Laws and Conſtitutions the Crown is Hereditary; but if any Uſurper or Traytor will not ſuffer it to be ſo, but puts by the right Heir, and gets poſſeſſion himſelf, the Laws and Conſtitutions allow him to be King; yes marry, and a Lawful King too; *i. e.* the Crown goes in a Lineal Succeſſion, whilſt People are peaceable and obedient; but if they be troubleſome and rebellious, then it is catch as catch can, and he had Right and Law of his ſide who gets poſſeſſion, and ſo will another, and another, without end, who can ſucceſſively wreſt the poſſeſſion from thoſe who had the right whilſt they could keep poſſeſſion. Did ever any Body hear of ſuch a Conſtitution as this? Or, was ever any thing better fitted to produce Eternal Confuſions? Certainly you have a mind to perſwade us, that our Conſtitutions were made by the *Wiſe men* of *Goatham*, or the *Wiſer men* of *Bedlam*. Sir! I have look'd with both my Eyes, and cannot ſee *how Happy we are* (as you tell us) *in this*; and I am afraid you have been cheated with falſe Spectacles; but at laſt you are willing to qualifie the matter, and to ſuffer this only, *till the ordinary*

rule can be fairly recovered. If this be ſo, pray why is it not recovered? Sure you will not plead that in Juſtification of a *People*, which is notoriouſly their Fault, and ſuch a Fault as is in their power to mend when they pleaſe; let them but unanimouſly (as they ought) return to their Duty and Loyalty, and the thing will do it ſelf *fairly* enough, and without any great pains, trouble, or danger; but you preſently relapſe, and become a zealous Advocate for your *Extraordinary Kings*, in whoſe behalf you plead *Acts of Parliament made by extra-lineal Kings*, which were confirmed (*ſubmitted to*, you ſubtily phraſe it) by the *Lineal Heirs*, and theſe were *approved by Lawyers*, nor did the *Church ever remonſtrate againſt them*. And what of all this? Let the Uſurpation, or Confuſions, be what they will, ſtill Men will eat and drink, buy and ſell, and ſuch like acts; nor do I think that ſuch a State doth acquit Men from the obligation to do (what in them lies) ſuch things as ſeem abſolutely neceſſary for the preſervation of the Society and the real Good of Mankind, and if any ſuch things as are neceſſary for the management of Humane Affairs, and which are accompanied with common Juſtice in themſelves, ſhould be now done or enacted, and hereafter confirmed by King *JAMES*, I know no reaſon to remonſtrate againſt this; but I think the need of ſuch a confirmation, is a demonſtration where the Right and Authority lies, which is an odd way of proving the right of your *extra-lineal Kings*. But, pray Sir, upon ſuch *extraordinary Interruptions*, did all Men ever think themſelves bound to approve them? Did they not ſtill, as opportunity ſerved, aſſiſt Right? Did not ſuch proceedings coſt a world of Blood and Treaſure, to none, or rather very ill purpoſe, whilſt no peace or eaſe could be had, till things were brought to rights again? When matters are in trouble or confuſion, wiſe and good Men think it the beſt way to put an end to them aſſoon as may be; but you caſt out that Right, which only can reſtore our Peace; and when you have conjured up moſt horrid Confuſions, plead for their continuance; I know not what could be done more by an Advocate of the Prince of *Darkneſs*. As for what you ſay concerning *Biſhop Overall's Convocation-Book*, I am ſorry that a pretender to ſo much modeſty ſhould be guilty of ſuch an impudent aſſertion, when that matter hath been ſo fully cleared by ſo many learned and judicious Pens. At laſt you very gravely give us *your Opinion*, *That in the late Oath of Allegiance*, *the word* Succeſſors *was added*, *after* Heirs, *on this very ſelf-ſame ground*; *That though Heirs*, *by the ordinary courſe*, *are the Legal Succeſſors*, *yet others legally may ſucceed in caſes extraordinary*. This it is for Men to give their Opinions without-book, and without any other conſideration, than to pervert the State of the caſe. Had you given your ſelf the ſmall trouble to read over the Oath, you could not for ſhame have put this interpretation upon it; for the expreſs words of it are *Lawful Succeſſors*, which follow the word *Heirs*, by way of limitation or reſtraint, to ſhew that

none

none ſhall ſucceed but the Legal Heir. And thus, Sir, the Words of the Oath, inſtead of admitting, plainly and peremptorily exclude your *extraordinary Succeſſors, and extra lineal Kings*: Thus your new invention hath added a freſh abſurdity, inſtead of being a remedy, to thoſe many others which your Party run into upon diſcourſes of this matter; and though you mince the matter, yet you might as well have been *ſo bold to ſay, The Oath requires Allegiance to unlawful Succeſſors*, as what you have ſaid; for whilſt there is One in Being, and claiming, to whom the right really belongs, What can your *extraordinary Succeſſors* be, but Tyrants, Uſurpers, ſuch as rob others of their right, and live by injuſtice and rapine? To tell Men, that they ought to aſſiſt a Tyrant againſt their Lawful Prince, and to preach up the Obligation of Obedience and Allegiance to a known Uſurper, would look like very odd Doctrine; but do not call them by thoſe buggiſh Names of *Tyrants* and *Uſurpers*, only ſay they are *extraordinary Succeſſors*, or *extralineal Kings*, and then you may ſay all this and more, and be thought a zealous Saint for it too: Is not this a very pretty trick to catch *Dotterils*, and gull poor People out of all Truth and Honeſty with new-coyn'd Phraſes?

You might have ſuffered *Dyſcheres* to ſay as much as all this; but inſtead of that you onely put this faint Queſtion in his mouth, which being neither clear nor full, may be liable to various Exceptions: *Can be be legal that thruſts out the* legal King, *or* legal Succeſſor? (p. 5.) I doubt not but you will ſtrain a point to make him ſo; and indeed in your way of arguing I do not underſtand how any King, or any thing called a King, can want a good Title, who has actual Poſſeſſion; but let us ſee your fine Art of proving Right Wrong, and Wrong Right: Your Diſcourſe of *Kings thruſting out Kings* is a direct thruſting out right, and an encouraging and juſtifying ambitious Perſons in embroiling the World in perpetual Wars and Confuſions: But I ſhall not expoſe it as it deſerves, becauſe it is nothing to the caſe of a plain known right and no right; and if you would make a fair Anſwer here, you ought to give a direct Anſwer to this Queſtion: If a Perſon really having no right, doth diſclaim any right to a thing, and by publick Declarations doth profeſs, that he makes no Pretenſions to it, nor hath any deſign to diſturb another in his right; I ſay, if this perſon nevertheleſs ſhall by ill arts ſeize it, Doth this, notwithſtanding all his Proteſtations and Declarations to the contrary, even againſt all right and reaſon, create him a right whether he will or no? If ſo, then I find right will be always on the ſtrongeſt and cunningeſt ſide; and ſo generally will be fitter for Knaves than honeſt Men. Your Inſtance in the Houſes of *York* and *Lancaſter* come not up to ſo plain a Caſe as this: Where things are obſcure and dark, (as that Title was, and perhaps ſtill is to moſt men,) great allowances are to be made; *Lancaſter* had the more obvious, *York* the better Title; though of late the learned Dr. *St*— by a modeſt baſtardizing the onely

Daughter

Daughter of that heroick Prince, *Lionel* Duke of *Clarence*, ſo many Ages after her death, has rendred the rights of thoſe two Houſes more intricate than ever, which if he had done in the days of *Henry* VIII. (who laid ſo faſt hold on his Mothers Title, derived from that traduced Lady, that 'tis thought the Apprehenſions of it haſtened his Father's End,) that reſenting Prince in all likelihood would have preferred him to ſome thing elſe than a Biſhoprick. But what means this preaching up Confuſion? The Nation then weltered in Bloud and Gore, till an undoubted Title put an end to that Quarrel: But you would have us obſtinately maintain a bad Title, that our Miſeries might have no end; a rare Example of Juſtice and Love to your Countrey! As for the *Ceſſion* you mention, you would do well to prove it a little better, before you thus run away with it for granted; you know we deny it, and have given our Reaſons for it, to which I know no Anſwer returned, unleſs it be Gaols, Fines, and Pillories, and Threatenings to help it with Hemp. But you ſay, *the hereditary Succeſſion was not violently broken, but altered by Conſent of the next Heirs.* He had need of a caſe-hardened Face, who will undertake to defend this: With your leave, Sir! it was broken with a Witneſs; for there were then four before your Idol, and now there are ſix; and will you ſay there was no violence, when our native Prince was cloſe confin'd in his own Kingdom, in the midſt of his own Subjects, to their eternal Shame, by a foreign and a pitiful parcel of tattered beggarly Rapeſcallions, whom the Boys of the City of *London* might have pelted to death with Stones, if the Senſe of our Countrey's Honour, as well as our Chriſtian Loyalty had not been utterly ſtifled. But you will needs perſuade us, that *this was done with Conſent*: Now you would have done well to have produced the Conſent of King *James* and the Prince of *Wales*, who ought to be ſerved in the firſt place: And then as for the two Princeſſes, whom certainly you mean by thoſe whom you falſly call the *next Heirs*, they may diſpoſe of their own as they pleaſe; but they ought not, cannot give away another's right: Onely as to the Princeſs *Ann* of *Denmark*, if ſhe have given up her right, it will concern her for her Safety to make it as publick as ſhe can; but if ſhe have not given it away, it then perhaps may concern her to make as much haſte after her Father as may be, and to carry her Son with her, out of *Herod*'s Clutches; for if her Siſter ſhould dye, 'tis ten to one it proves too late. But the neateſt Fetch is, when we are told that all this was done, That *a Prince of ſuch mighty Conduct might be a Wall of Defence, as well to the Royal Heirs, as to the Religion, Rights, and Liberties of the People.* Has he not actually raviſhed away the Rights of all the *Royal Heirs* in being? and call you this their *Defence?* So Robbers are a *Defence* to Travellers, and Wolves to Sheep: Pray next time you write, be pleaſed to furniſh us with a parcel of white Crows, or green Jackdaws, or perſuade us out of our Chriſtian Names. What a *Defence* your Hero hath been

been to *Religion*, the miſerable condition of the Church of *England*, and the growth of Atheiſm and Fanaticiſm are ſufficient witneſſes; and then for the *Peoples Rights and Liberties*, how ſtrongly they are *wall'd* about, if they be not ſenſible already, I doubt not but they will in a little time. And now Sir, if you will give me the ſame liberty *to put together*, which you take; I cannot learn from all this, how our old Laws and Oaths binds us to your *new Allegiance*; but that rather our Conſtitutions and Oaths binds us to King JAMES and not to *William*, though the contrary hereto is your ſhameleſs concluſion from your wild Premiſes.

All along you make *Dyſcheres* (by whom you repreſent us) to give up the cauſe as far as you go, which diſingenuous dealing we have too much cauſe to complain of; but the better to detect it, I muſt follow your ſteps; and now comes ſuch a tremendous *Objection*, that I wonder your Joynts did not tremble, and your Hand ſhake, when you ſet Pen to Paper; it is to this effect, *That when the violence is eſſentially unjuſt, unnatural, and contrary to the moral and eternal Laws of God and* Righteouſneſs, *no Human compacts can ratifie ſuch wrong, or juſtifie and confirm what is eſſentially injurious, nor ought the Prieſts of the moſt High God to conſecrate and confirm ſuch Rapes by Oaths and Religious Sponſions.* If there be any ſuch thing as this (and ſuch I fear we ſhall find there is, if there be any ſuch thing as God's Commandments) we had need have a care what we do; That Man's wit is ill beſtowed on him, who argues himſelf out of his own Soul. But here you think to ſlip your Neck out of the Collar by telling us, *That the internal Immorality of all actions muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed from the civil Conſequences of them.* Well, be it ſo, we will do this for you too as fairly and carefully as we can; and what then? Why then, ſuppoſe (ſay you p. 6.) *A Son by fraudulent Arts gets Judgment in Law, and ſeizes his Father's Eſtate and Body by Execution, and ſtarves his Father in Priſon, this Man's Immorality is damnable.* Is it ſo? I think this is a bone for ſome body to pick, which may hold him tug tho' his *Teeth* were as long as his *NOSE*: But, Sir, what if a Daughter ſhould do thus? Will not this Womans Immorality be damnable? If not, pray next time you write, give us a reaſon of the difference: But it ſeems if they ſhould be both damned, *yet the Judges, Sheriffs, and other Officers are innocent*; It may be ſo, whilſt they act as Officers of Law, and according to the directions of Law; but if your Judges, Sheriffs, or other Officers, make themſelves Parties, and join with and aſſiſt ſuch a wicked Son or Daughter to effect ſuch an evil act, or do applaud and approve it, when they know it be done by ſuch wicked and unlawfull Arts, then their being *Officers of Law* will rather encreaſe than deminiſh their guilt: And ſo for your *Robbers* and *Pirates*, a Man may lawfully *ſuffer* by them, tho' it were better if he could eſcape it; but if you will plead that their Robberies and Piracies are lawfull, if you ſay they require a juſt

right to what they get by ſuch wicked means, or if you actually join with them, and rob and ſhare in their Booties, you will be as very a Rogue as they; and which is moſt like the Caſe, I leave others to judge. Much ſuch another inſtance is *your Lord of a Mannor*; let him look how he came to be ſo, I may treat with him as Lord of the Mannor, whom the Law declares to be ſo: But if the Lord's Tenants conſpire againſt their lawfull Landlord, and diſpoſſeſs him of his Mannor, and invite a Stranger, and ſay and *ſwear* he ſhall be Lord of the Mannor, and accordingly pay Homage and Fealty to him, you, Sir, may *determine for their ſwearing* and lying too, if you pleaſe, but I ſhall have nothing the better opinion of your Honeſty for it. But now let the Fifth Commandment look to it ſelf, for it was never ſo hardly beſet: There are a ſort of *Proteſtants*, who I think are reſolved by making away the Fifth Commandment, to be even with the *Papiſts* for ſuppreſſing the Second; and indeed according as ſome Men act and write, unleſs it be to furniſh pretence, and to ſhew our fine Cloaths, and eat roaſt Meat on *Sundays*, I ſee not what occaſion they have for any Commandments; and ſo they might make Religion a Law of Liberty, or a Liberty from all Law; and I do not perceive, Sir, that you much mend the matter; you ſay, *That from the Fifth Commandment we cannot charge K. W. with Subjection to* King JAMES, *&c.* (p. 7.) If by this you mean, that we cannot thence prove him to have been his Subject, I do not know, that ever any Man attempted ſuch a thing; but does a Nephew and a Son-in-Law owe no *Duty*, if he owe not that which is properly called Subjection? Or may a Man, becauſe he is not his Subject, ſpoil another of all he has? And muſt all perſons applaud and approve the Act, and ſwear he is in the right? The Caſe of an own Daughter is ſtill more ſevere; but for that you ſay, *That ſhe is in Duty bound to follow her Husband's Fortune, Order and Authority, even againſt the Will of her Father, and this with a more plenary conſent, if ſhe judged her Husbands Cauſe to be juſt.* I do not think either her or your judgment worth a farthing, unleſs the Cauſe be juſt in it ſelf. Sorry Arguments will ſerve to perſuade Ambitious perſons, that they have right to a Crown, though unconcerned perſons at the ſame time plainly ſee the fallaciouſneſs of them. But, Sir, I am not ſatisfied with your bare word, that a Woman is bound thus to follow her Husband through thick and thin; I grant that ſhe ought to be the Partner both of his Joys and Sorrows, but let her have a care how ſhe becomes Partner in his Sins; nor doth the relation of a Wife take away the relation of a Child, as you ſeem to intimate, tho' you are aſhamed plainly to ſay it; they may indeed limit each other, ſo that the Father may not command the Daughter any thing inconſiſtent with the Duty of a Wife, nor the Husband the Wife any thing inconſiſtent with the Duty of a Child to a Parent, but yet the great end of theſe relations is to ſtrengthen and ſupport, not to deſtroy each other,

as

as you chosely insinuate. Besides, your reason is a mistake in it self, as to this Case; for could you with all your tricks of *Legerdemain* remove both King *James* and the Prince of *Wales* out of the way, then there would rise another relation, and then he in these Dominions must *follow her Fortunes*, not she his; for according to our Constitutions she would be his Queen, and here he must be her Subject: It is true the Name of King would be allowed, but the Power by our Constitutions would be lodged in her; and he would be liable to offend against her *Laws*, to Treason against her Person, and to be tried by her Authority. It is well known, that though *Philip* of *Spain*'s Name was made use of with Queen *Mary*'s, yet when it came to matter of real and proper Authority, neither *Lords* nor *Commons* would own him for any thing more, than their Queens Husband, not their King properly speaking; but to let that pass, in short, all that has been done in this case being so contrary to the Duties of those relations, which both they and we were and are under, and those Duties peremptorily required by the Fifth Commandment, the contrary to your Conclusion must unavoidably follow, *That in Moral Justice they could neither desire or accept, nor we give the Crown, much less ought we to confirm it by Oath.* Your fulsome Panegyrick I pass over; because you cannot but think it well bestowed, when you shall consider from whom that Saying fell, *No body would trust an Englishman but the Devil.*

You do us manifest injustice, when you make us to say, *That no Settlement must be admitted, under Powers procured by breach of God's Commandments*, (p. 8.) And this in all reason you must do knowingly and wilfully; because I think there is not one, who in our behalf hath concerned himself in the matter of the *Convocation Book*, but hath stated this question, and always admitted a *thorough Settlement*, whatever were the means whereby it was procured: 'Tis true, we neither commend nor encourage such wicked doings; but on the other hand, we do not think Dominion to be founded in Grace, and that a Man cannot have a good Title, unless he be a good Christian; we can mourn over the bad Man, whilst we submit to the good Title; but we complain, that we have no Settlement, nor any thing like a good Title, to which we may submit; for who can own that to be a good Title, against which there are prior and better Titles in being, contesting and claiming? Or who can take that for a *Settlement*, where a bad Title by bad means is maintained against a just and good Title? But you ought even in Complement to your great *Mogul*, to have omitted that Catalogue of sins, of which usually consists an Usurper's Trade, *Killing*, *Robbery*, *Deceit*, *Covetousness*, *false Accusations*, *Lyes*, *Pretences*, *Subornations*, *Perjuries*, *Treasons*, &c. now put all these together and a bad Title, and then guess the Owner; and when you have done, tell me seriously, whether the complying with a good Title without all these were not much more becoming a Christian, than to set up such a foure Stranger by such Monstrous Courses.

You will needs suppose, *That if it be not Life to King* JAMES, *then it is not the Breach of God's Commandments that incapacitates the Prince of his Crown*; but why may not both do it? For because the lawfull King is living and claiming, therefore the Commandments of God require of all his Subjects, that they pay him their Dutiful and Loyal Obedience: They ought by all honest means to support him in his Throne, or restore him to it, as his Condition requires. But if in a rant (for I did not expect such a Blasphemous expression from such a pretender to Modesty) you will say, *That such the suffrage of the greatest Laws of God, Reason and Nations, you may defend the present Governors*, &c. *i. e.* in plain *English*, that you may first betray your lawfull King, and then fight for an Usurper against him; you might as well justifie all the Usurpations in the World, and make *Absalom* and *Maffianello* as lawfull Powers as *David* and *Solomon*; and in the consequence too you must encourage all the Rebellions and Treasons that ever were or shall be: And are not these brave things to justifie *by the greatest Laws of God, Reason, and Nations?* If Christian Religion can teach this, it were a just provocation to all the Kings in the World to combine together to extirpate such a turbulent and abominable Profession from off the face of the Earth: But I thank God I have not so learnt Jesus Christ.

To the Objection, *That Allegiance seems to imply Right*, &c. *since Allegiance follows the Right, which is a tender point to be sworn to*, (p. 9.) you answer, *that the Oath expresses no form of assurmation concerning Right*; What if it do not, so long as it expresses what manifestly includes Right? and this *Allegiance* directly and immediately doth; for it is the proper duty of a Subject to his lawfull Sovereign, and contains an obligation to the performance of all those Acts, which are required from every Subject as he stands in relation to his rightfull Sovereign: It is the immediate result of that relation; so that where you deny your Allegiance due, you in consequence deny the Right of the Prince; where you pay your Allegiance, it is as owning him to be your Prince; and therefore when you swear Allegiance, you tacitly swear a Right: For though there is a sort of Obedience or Observance, which may be paid to Usurpers, Robbers, and Pirates; yet *Allegiance* may not be paid to them, as being that natural duty of the Subject, which the Laws and Constitutions have appropriated to their legal Prince, and made inseparable from him; and now I hope you will not tell us that the Oath doth not express Allegiance: Well, but for all this you are *certain no such thing was intended*, for you say your *Estates in Parliament rejected the motions made for an assertion of Right*, and yet you immediately add, *That they and the ensuing Parliament judged their admition of K.* William *and Q.* Mary *to be their lawfull right, rebus sic stantibus*; but yet say you, *They bound not us to swear so.* (p. 9.) I confess this is pretty juggling, but my Friends, it will never serve any honest Man's turn; for did your

Con-

Conventioners, or those that followed them, intend to bind you to any thing? If they intended to bind you to nothing, they laid their wise heads together to such a purpose, as never yet, any Men did; but if they did intend to bind you to your new Governors in any thing, what can that be reasonably supposed to be, other than what they admitted them in, and that you say, *was in their lawfull right*; they were indeed ashamed at that time to put it into the body of the Oath, and besides they knew it would have made many persons abhor it; but it is plain, that this they designed and trick'd upon you; hence you may perceive that your slippery remark will not deliver you from the *intention of the Imposer*; and indeed if that could be avoided, and what sense others please imposed, the Oath might be taken in a thousand several senses, and not one come up with the sense and design of the Imposers, which in this case always is the security of the Government. Besides, a thousand other mischiefs would follow, vacating all Oaths, and destructive of all Government and humane Society: For if Oaths may be thus eluded, Promises and Contracts would soon follow their fortune, as being less sacred. Now, Sir, you would do well to answer these and the like reasons, before you so peremptorily assert any *inferiour Courts to be authentick Interpreters of publick Oaths*: You had best have a care that you be not followed with a cry of *Priviledge of Parliament*, and indeed that legislative Power is little better than ridiculous, which may be authentically evaded, or made quite another thing, by the inferior Ministers of it; and after all; the Interpretations of those Courts will not excuse you from *Insincerity and prevaricating with the State*, as you seem to fear. (p. 10.) For if those Courts did give a lower and more easie sense of the Oaths, than could reasonably be thought was intended by the Imposers, you ought not to catch at that for an advantage which they had no Power to give; nor ought you to join with them in eluding the Oath, but to take care of your selves, that they neither cosen you, nor you others; for an Oath ought to be taken in *Judgment, Truth, and Righteousness*, in all which points you will fail, if you take this course. But have a care you do not gull your self at the last? for what is that *innocent sense, which the most tender Recusant might have sworn to?* Truly I think the secret is worth Money, and poor as I am I would have given something to know it; but that we may not trifle with our Consciences, I desire you and all your *innocent* Brethren, to give me any one *innocent sense*, wherein an Oath may be taken to an Usurper in order to the maintaining his Usurpation against the lawfull King; and though I do not believe, that either you or they (though Men of admirable invention) can ever do it; yet if you could, it would not do your work; for it is not what sense you give or take, but what they impose. But, Sir, whilst you plead for others Sincerity, you render your own very suspicious; for why are you so scrupulous about the sense of the Oath? Do not you insolently

 charge

charge King *James* with a *Ceſſion?* Do not you thence ground a *Vacancy?* Do not you aſſert *William to be admitted according to the Laws and Conſtitutions, and by the proper Judges?* Now though theſe things be never ſo falſe, yet if you believe them true, you believe him to be your Lawful King; and therefore, according to your declared Judgment, may without ſcruple take the Oath in as ſevere a ſenſe, as ever any Oath of Allegiance has been given in amongſt us; and therefore for you to make ſuch a pother about Senſes, and to look about ſo ſharp for an *innocent Senſe*, is enough to make a Man ſuſpect, that you do not deal *bona fide*; but that there is ſomething ſtill gauls you, and that your Conſcience lies ſnarling within, whilſt you make ſuch fair weather abroad.

The *Impiety of the Revolution* hath been already conſidered, and your Queſtion about *Settlement* anſwered; your pitty we ſcorn; and whether we or you be the Men, *whoſe Minds are intangled with wrong Notions, that they can act well no way*, you ought to have conſidered, that *ſuch Men's Infirmities* have leſs right to overthrow, than to *obſtruct publick Conſtitutions*; you ſhall have free leave to object the latter to us, when you have cleared your ſelves of the former. Whereas you think thoſe tame Perſons, who ſubmit, *to be one ſort of the meek who ſhall inherit the Earth*; though I do not take ſuch eaſie Submitters to wickedneſs to be any of God's *meek*; yet I believe you have hit the true reaſon of moſt Men's ſubmiſſion; and upon the Principles many have proceeded, we may have, as occaſion ſerves, *meek* Forſwearers, *meek* Rebels, *meek* Traytors; yea, *meek* Jews, *meek* Turks, *meek* Renegadoes, and all to *inherit the Earth*; yet after this ſlender return, as if our Mouths were quite ſtop'd, and we had nothing to ſay, you make us as it were to threaten a *better Plea for our Cauſe, if ever King* James *return*: The Scoff is not worth Thanks; but, Sir, may King *James* return aſſoon as God pleaſes, we need not ſtay till then, but can make our Plea now, and need not your help, who take ſo much pains to ſpoil it; and this your Godly Brethren are too well aware of, which makes them ſo ſtrictly guard the Preſs, and be ſo very cruel to all, on whom they can faſten any thing in the leaſt tending that way; witneſs the barbarous Uſage of a poor Boy, whoſe Mother, a Widdow, is not able to find him Bread, who by the ſly arts of your never-forgiving High-Prieſt, hath, in ſpite of all honeſt endeavours, been kept in *New-gate* near a year and half; and there lies ſtill, and like to lie, to rot or ſtarve, meerly for going on an Errand, and carrying he knew not what: As juſtly, in a manner, might an illiterate Man be hanged for carrying the *Greek* Teſtament, as a poor Boy thus uſed for delivering a Paper, not knowing what was in it: Surely, he hath forgot, that there is a God, who hath both promiſed to hear the Cry, and revenge the Wrongs of the Widdow and Fatherleſs.

It is a material Queſtion, *By what Authority you transferred your Allegiance, without his* (*i. e.* King *James*) *will?* And it is no trifling Objection, *That you were ſworn to him, not to the Eſtates of this Realm:* But the Anſwer is amazing, *That you had his authentick Grant for ſo doing*, (p. 11.) If this could be produced, it would go a great way, though it would not fully do the buſineſs; but ſee what a cunning Man can do, that which no body elſe thought on, he hath found in *King* James's *Declaration of Indulgence, where* (you ſay) *he does diſpenſe with the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to all his Subjects.* I am not bound to defend every act, either of him or you; however that act is far from deſtroying his right; for the diſpenſing with a thing is not the giving an Order and Grant to transfer it to another: And farther, you ought to conſider, that it is one thing to diſpenſe with an Oath of Allegiance, another thing to diſpenſe with the Allegiance it ſelf; an Oath may give a farther enforcement to Allegiance, but the Allegiance it ſelf is antecedent to it, and ariſes from the natural relation betwixt Subject and Prince; he might be unwilling, that every diſloyal act of a fickle raſh People, ſhould ſeem to be aggravated with the horrid crime of Perjury; but he never diſcharged them of the Allegiance it ſelf; for that had been to un-king himſelf, which certainly never entred into his thoughts; for after that he reigned as King, and required and uſed the Allegiance of his Subjects as before: But if he had done more than you ſay, and not only diſpenſed with, but acquitted and abſolved all his Subjects, not only from the Oath, but the Allegiance it ſelf, it would not help your Cauſe; for though he might de-throne himſelf; yet immediately thereupon our Conſtitutions, which admit no *interregnum*, had tranſplanted our Allegiance, and given it to the next Heir: For if a King die or reſign, we are not left to our ſelves to pay our Allegiance to whom we will, but under the penalty of Treaſon are confined to the Lawful Succeſſor. And thus you ſee we are no way obliged to plead, that *That act was ineffectual and null in it ſelf, as being contrary to Law*; which is that you ſay for us, with the deſign to draw on us the *odium* of cenſuring the Actions of an afflicted Prince.

But I find you are a Man *tam Marte, quam Mercurio*, otherwiſe called an *Ambodexter*; for if you cannot perſwade us, you will affrigt us into the Oath, or any thing elſe; for you endeavour to poſſeſs us with an Opinion, that King *James* (if ever he return) will hang all that do not Swear and pay Allegiance to K. *William*; a hard caſe, that a Man can be no way honeſt without hanging: But why this extream ſeverity? Why! Becauſe *the lineal Heir may hang a Man as a Traytor, for breach of Allegiance to an extralineal King*, p. 12. Well! but if King *James* ſhould hang up all that did not pay Allegiance to *William*, one would think he ſhould not ſpare thoſe who would not pay Allegiance to himſelf, and this would make clear work. When *Edward* the Fourth firſt joyned

Battle

Battle againſt *Henry* the Sixth, do not you think this would have made a powerful Speech for him to his *Souldiers*? *Gentlemen! go on couragiouſly, your Cauſe is good, the Crown is evidently my right, and if I can recover it by your aſſiſtance, I will certainly hang you up every Man for fighting againſt the extralineal King* Henry *the Sixth, who here appears in the Field againſt us, and keeps me from it.* Such perſwaſions could not fail to prevail with Men to fight to the laſt drop of Blood. But, Sir, though I do think that a Man may do that under an Uſurpation, for which he may deſerve to be hanged afterwards; and that an exil'd Prince at his return may juſtly puniſh wickedneſs done in his abſence; yet I do not believe there is any Law to hang a Man for Loyalty, and of all Men living I leaſt fear it from King *James*: But in truth all this hanging ſtuff ſeems to have another deſign, and not to tell what King *James* may do, but what you would have others to do; as if they were excuſeable for any ſeverity towards thoſe, who deny them that for which (as you ſay) even King *James* himſelf may puniſh them. It is a pious hint to your Government and your *Mobb*: We are a living ſhame and reproach to you; you cannot ſee, ſpeak, or hear of us, but bitterneſs of Spirit, and pangs of Conſcience ſeize you; the Devil tempts you to think your Sin unpardonable, and that your only ſecurity is in making all others as bad as your ſelves; and therefore you would have none find Mercy, who will not caſt in their Lot among you. I know not how *Lucifer* might hug ſuch a Privy Counſellor; but I muſt tell you, that this ill becomes your Coat; eſpecially being a Man that pretends to ſo much compaſſion and tenderneſs of Conſcience.

Whereas it is alledged, that *this would make Subjection due to* O. C. you produce ſeveral arguments to prove the diſparity betwixt him and the P. of *O.* whereas there is ſcarce any arguments of them, that is not equally valid againſt the one as the other; nay, I am ſure ſome are more valid againſt the P. of *O.* then *O. C.* but this hath been clearly done by ſo many Hands already, that I am aſhamed to repeat them; but they ought to be a ſtark ſhame to you, who pretend to be a Seeker of Satisfaction, and will take no notice of them; which looks as if you were rather reſolved to deceive both your ſelf and others, and to cloak it over with ſham pretences.

Hitherto the Arguments have been generally drawn from the Power of the Civil Magiſtrate, or rather from the pretended power of thoſe who are no Magiſtrates to us; and you would perſwade *Dyſcheres* to admit theſe for true, and conſequently your inferences; but you will find, that you have reckoned without your Hoſt, and by that time you have read their Anſwers, you may eaſily perceive, that I am as ready to conclude the quite contrary: *That the Church remains with us, with whom is the true Authority; that in erecting Altar againſt Altar you are become formal Schiſmaticks, having cut off your ſelves from the Church, in forſaking the*

true

true Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and adhering to, and ſupporting the falſe againſt it; and that as you are Schiſmaticks we ought not to frequent your Publick Aſſemblies, nor have any Eccleſiaſtical Communion with you, other than to convince you of your Sin, and perſwade you to Repentance. Now I beſeech you, as you have any tenderneſs for your own and others Souls, that you will ſeriouſly conſider theſe things: This muſt be the caſe on the one ſide or the other; and though Intereſt, Plenty, and Eaſe, may put a ſpecious gloſs upon weak Arguments; yet at the great Day of Accompts all falſe gloſſes will be taken off, and things will appear as they are; and therefore, what temptations ſoever we may otherwiſe have, it is our higheſt concern to take them ſo now.

Having thus (as you vainly think) made ſure of your inferences, you take leave of Civil, and enter upon Eccleſiaſtical Arguments. Now it is a ſad thing, that a Man ſhould have two Strings to his Bow, and both rotten; for here you make more woful work than before; the moſt ſpecious of all your Arguments being either manifeſt Miſtakes, or notorious Slanders. The Firſt Objection is concerning the Prayers, which might have been put much more fully and ſtrongly; but being a thing ſo well known, I ſhall only take notice of your Anſwers. And, Firſt, you ſay, *The Prayers were conſented to by all the Recuſant-Biſhops, and by them (for their Officers without any prohibition) ſent to the Clergy of every Dioceſs, and by them generally received; the Biſhops were preſent at them, directed their Clergy upon conſultation to uſe them; and thus things ſtood till the day of their Suſpenſion, and no blowing the Trumpet againſt Perjury* &c. p. 14. Now if this were true, yet if the Prayers are truly chargeable with ſomething unlawful and wicked, that is ſuch a daring affront to God Almighty, that neither any act or neglect of theirs can juſtifie either yours or my concurrence in them; and therefore I wonder why you ſhould make ſuch a Lye, when it will not ſerve you for a Reaſon, for it is well known to all who frequented their Communion, that they never read or uſed thoſe Prayers; and that is no improbable argument, that they neither conſented to them, nor ſent them abroad: But the truth is, that they were ſo far from either conſenting to them, or ſending them to their Clergy, that they had no certainty of the thing, till it was done and paſt; and whether ſome-body told you this Lye, or you made it your ſelf, if you pleaſe to conſult the *Printer* in the *Savoy*, if he dare ſpeak Truth, and by the way I muſt tell you, that he is a bold Man who dare ſpeak ſuch a Truth at this time, and he can tell you how they were ſent, and who ſent them; and that thoſe, whom you call *Recuſant Biſhops*, were purpoſely kept ignorant, that they might not be able to give any obſtructions to the buſineſs. And now, Sir, do not you think that you have acted a very mannerly part to our Reverend Fathers, in exclaiming againſt them, and comparing them to *winking Watchmen*, and *dumb Dogs*, becauſe they do not

get up o'th' top o'th' Monument, and baul out againſt a thing which they knew nothing of? It could not be done before, and ſince it hath been cried out againſt ſufficiently; have they not ſuffered enough already, unleſs you may perſecute them with calumnies? But you are not alone in this caſe; for they are ſeldom mentioned in any Papers referring to this Revolution, but they are fouly abuſed, and charged with things which they were never guilty of; by which means they are falſly repreſented even to good Men, and ſuffer in their good Names, as well as their Perſons and Eſtates; this in a great meaſure I my ſelf could prove: But, Sir, I will no farther concern my ſelf with you, than as you wrongfully charge them, and that only in the proper places; you ſeem to be offended, that there has not been cry enough againſt Perjury; others, if we mention it, ſay we are Uncharitable, Cenſorious, Proud, Peeviſh, Raſh, and all the ill-natured Titles their Schiſmatical Candor can afford us: Thus it is impoſſible to pleaſe you, whether we ſpeak or hold our Tongues; but for your own part, ſince you are for ſuch loud crying out againſt the ſin, I hope you will not be offended, if hereafter you hear of Perjury more often. Your Plea, that you do not *ſine ratione inſanire* had been better let alone, it being generally a rul'd caſe, that thoſe are incurable, who do *cum ratione inſanire.*

Another reaſon, (though you ſhuffle both together) why we may lawfully join in thoſe Prayers, is becauſe (as you would perſuade us) King *James* and your King *William* are very good Friends; truly this is the firſt time I have heard of it, and I could wiſh it were true on good terms. But let us ſee how you prove it, why *'tis certain the Prayers expreſs him not*; very true, and it is very rare becauſe odious, that Enemies are particularly named; but if general Prayers do not mean ſomething for or againſt particular perſons, though not particularly named, the greateſt part not only of the *Liturgy*, but of all Prayers whatſoever are to no purpoſe; but though they were not arrived to that unheard of impudence as to name him as an *Enemy* in their Prayers, yet he is revil'd, bely'd, defam'd, and bitterly curſed in Coffee-houſes, and even in the open ſtreets; that is not only ſuffered, but encouraged: or if any Man ſhould chance to drink the Health of this good Friend of yours and your King, it perhaps might coſt him a Fine of 200 Marks, beſide other ill uſage. Sir, if you uſe your Friends thus, I deſire to be none of them; but you are reſolved they muſt and ſhall be Friends; for you flatly ſay, *That you do not rank him among the number of (your) K.* William's *Enemies, for an Enemy is one that deſireth to injure a Man, and we are not ſure, that King* JAMES *doth ſo deſign againſt King* William. And do you think King *James* to be that Good and rigorouſly Juſt Perſon, who would do no wrong even to that Man, who by Treachery defrauded him of two Kingdoms, and then by force drove him from the third, and with the utmoſt malice ſtill proſecutes him, and all that adhere to him? and

can

can you at the ſame time juſtifie the Wrongs and Barbarities he hath received? Muſt a Man be abuſed for his Goodneſs? Methinks this makes but a ſcurvy Plea for the late proceedings: But if you do not believe this of King *James*, I do; but ſtill it will do you no ſervice; for ſuppoſing he will do no wrong, yet ſure he may demand and endeavour to recover his Right, and I am apt to think, that your little, ambitious *Dutch Saviour* would think no Man in the World ſo much his Enemy, as he that demands three Kingdoms from him: Nor do we call only thoſe Enemies, who deſign Injuries; but even all who actually oppoſe each other, or between whom there is any conteſt, let their deſigns be what they will, or their Cauſe right or wrong; and after all your daubing, he certainly is accounted the greateſt Enemy, for whoſe ſake all others are judged Enemies: Now though the King of *France* be ſuch an abominable Enemy, he ſhould ſoon be eſteemed the beſt Friend in the World, if he would but renounce the Intereſt of King *James*, and ſupport the Uſurpation of the Prince of *Orange*.

I did expect ſomething concerning the Ammunition Prayers; but you leave them to ſhift for themſelves; and yet you think there is a Prayer on the 29th of *May*, ſo dangerous, that you graciouſly give us leave *to forbear to be preſent at it*: But, Sir, who gave you authority to diſpenſe with terms of Communion? Or, did you ever know any ſober Society, that gave their Members liberty at pleaſure to take and refuſe of their terms of Communion? You have done more, I fear, than you will receive any thanks for; none you are like to have from us, who have no need of your Licenſe; and you ought not to expect it from thoſe who will think their Authority hereby invaded. But yet you think we need not be ſo very coy, as to the Prayer; for you ſay, *That you have been aſſured by a Good Father, that the Recuſant Biſhops did not at firſt ſtick at that; but that ſome gave directions and conſent to the uſe of it; and alſo, before their Suſpenſion deputed Perſons to adminiſter the Oath in the execution of the Authorities and Offices Epiſcopal thus deputed.* Sir, if I ſhould ſay your *Good Father* was an *arrant lying Knave*, and prove him ſo, I hope you would not only pardon my bluntneſs, but alſo be more careful for the future how you gave any credit to ſuch Perſons. As for any of their *conſenting or ſending*, it is only the former falſhood repeated, which I have anſwered already; and as for this pretended *deputation*, I will ſet before you the true ſtory, and then you and all Men may judge, how candidly our ſuffering Fathers are dealt with. On the 28th of *Jan.* the Biſhop of *London* and St. *Aſaph*, and ſome others, preſented themſelves before your mighty King *William*, with a mournful Addreſs, in behalf of our Reverend Fathers, then drawing near to a Civil Suſpenſion, and

ſince more than uncivilly deprived: This was the pretence, but it is reaſonable to think, that it was a complotted thing, and that the real deſign was to get their Authorities deputed in ſuch ſure Hands, as might effectually promote Perjury, and the thruſting Good Men out of poſſeſſion of their Eſtates and exerciſe of their proper Authorities; for the effects of this Addreſs was ſo far from being any kindneſs to them for whom it was pretended, that others were preſently hereupon deputed to exerciſe their reſpective Juriſdictions, *during their Suſpenſion, Deprivation, and till their Places ſhould be filled*: So that all they got by this pretended kindneſs to them, was to be ſtripp'd ſtark naked. But the Addreſſers having thus addreſſed themſelves into their ſeveral Juriſdictions, they then apply themſelves to our Reverend Fathers, and with a ſeeming humility and ſorrowfulneſs acquaint them how matters were ordered, requeſting them, that ſince it muſt be ſo, they would not be diſpleaſed at them, if they, who were ready to do them all the Service they could, did exerciſe thoſe Juriſdictions; to which they received an Anſwer to this effect, That ſince it was reſolved that it ſhould be done, whether they would or not, it was in a manner indifferent to them by whom it was done, though they were as willing it ſhould be done by thoſe who applied themſelves to them, as any others; and there is a certain Man, well skill'd in the *Revelations* and Chronology, who can tell you, that when he particularly applied himſelf to one of our deprived Fathers, he received this Anſwer, *Seeing I muſt be ſuſpended, that is in* Engliſh *hanged, it is all one to me, whether I be hanged on a Crab-tree or a Sweeting.* Sir, this is the real Truth of the matter, and is ſo far from being a deputation of their Authorities, that it doth not imply any conſent, other than what is always unavoidably extorted from every Man in the like circumſtances. Suppoſe a Sheriff, or Bayliff, ſhould come to a Gentleman, and tell him; Sir, I have an Execution againſt you, and muſt ranſack your Houſe, drive your Grounds, and ſeize your Goods and Cattle, pray be not angry, that I obſerve my Orders; and he ſhould with an angry ſmile return, *I know you will do what you liſt, do what you pleaſe*: Would any Man living take this for his giving his conſent, when they know he abhors it in his Soul, and would by any means prevent it? But indeed all ſuch kind of Sayings amount to no more than this, *I am under the Common Fate of Mankind, and though never ſo againſt my Will, muſt ſubmit, where I cannot help my ſelf.* Cannot a Man bear his afflictions patiently, without conſenting to the Wickedneſs of others, and the Wrongs done to himſelf? Would you have had them, like ſome fiery Women, flown in their Faces, and ſcratch'd out their Eyes, or rather behave themſelves with that Moderation and Temper which became their Station and Dignity?

This

This latter they have done; and therefore consider how foully and unjustly you have slander'd your Superiors through your own mistake: And remember, that at last all is a meer *Subterfuge*; for if they had made any Slip, it would not justifie your Wickedness.

What follows, *p.* 16, and 17. might have made an excellent Argument for *Julian* or *Diocletian*. You give many sly insinuations, as if we were guilty of great Crimes, but you name none in particular, and it is well you do not; for you know the charge against us, is, either our Religion, or our Loyalty; both which you and your Party have forsaken, but are ashamed to say so; and therefore would beat your Faults on our Backs. The Dangers you mention are to be prevented by Men's repenting of their Sins, not by going on and adding Sin to Sin: All your fine Words are to no other purpose, than to perswade us to be reconciled to prevent Schism, *i. e.* when the greatest part have betrayed a Good Cause, that the other would be debauched and go with them for company. You may tell us of *Novatian*, *Meletian*, *Luciferian*, and the like *Rigours*, when we refuse to receive you upon repentance, which the Church always required, in Order to the re-admission of such who had been Schismaticks, or censured for notorious Crimes; you are a very free Gentleman, who would have us give up not only all Ecclesiastical Discipline, but all Christian Principles, for fear of being *too rigorously Pious*: But the summ of all is, That we must do as you would have us, *Because the Church must yield to the State all just security to publick Peace and Order*. This I as freely grant you, as you can desire; and I think our former Oaths were given to that purpose, which if they had been well kept, we had been free from all those Mischiefs and Miseries, wherein we are now embroyled. But here give me leave to request an Answer to two Questions: First, If I should fall in amongst the *Banditi*, or any association of Villains whatsoever, Whether I am bound in Conscience to give them all the extravagant security they shall demand? Secondly, Whether the Authority Christ left in his Church, or the fix'd Nature of Good and Evil, may not prescribe such bounds, as neither ought the State to transgress in requiring, nor the Subject in yielding? Let the *Church give the State all security to publick Peace and Order*; let her be most exemplarily peaceable in her self; let her most effectually perswade Peace to others; and yet for all this, I am apt to think, that she is at her Liberty, whether she will give any Security to those who have no Authority; and ought to give no Security to Sin, even to the best Authority. You talk here like one that was more than an *Erastian*, and willing to give up not only the *Church*, but even *Good* and *Evil* it self to the State; indeed you endeavour to come off of this afterwards, but it is very scurvily.

After abundance of Queſtions and Anſwers, which would afford matter to fill a Volume, if ſtated throughly, you come at length to tell us your Mind, *That the People by judgment of Conſcience for their own Salvation, and the Church's Peace, may ſeparate from an Impoſtrous Biſhop, and addreſs to other Social Biſhops to conſecrate them another*: And for this you produce the inſtance of *Martialis* and *Baſilides*, p. 20. But what is this to our caſe? Are our Biſhops Impoſtors? This certainly you muſt mean, if you ſay any thing to the purpoſe; if it be ſo, the Work is done; prove only that, and we will forſake them; but if you cannot, bethink your ſelf what a villanous Crime it is, thus ſlily to inſinuate into the People, ſo miſchievous an Opinion of thoſe great and pious Sufferers: Beſides, if my Memory fail me not, the Crime of *Martialis* and *Baſilides* was Sacrificing, which, by the Canons of the Church, not only incapacitated them to diſcharge the Office of Biſhops, but even to communicate as Chriſtians, and reduced them to the State of Penitents, *uſque ad articulum mortis*, unleſs for ſpecial Reaſons the Church ſhewed particular favour: But the Crime of our Biſhops is, that they ſtick too cloſe to their Religion, and will not alter it to be in the mode of the times. If any be Apoſtates, they are your own dearly beloved Friends, for whom you take ſuch pains; they have forſaken the Church of *England*, and renounced the Chriſtian Principles they formerly maintained; they teach how to rob a Man without injuſtice, to forſwear without Perjury, to diſobey Father and Mother without breach of the Fifth Comment, and divers other ſuch Myſteries; which makes the Devil laugh in his Sleeve to ſee himſelf furniſhed with ſuch able Miniſters, who will do his Work in the World, whilſt he may lie idle: And if the People do ſeparate from ſuch as theſe, your Friend Mr. *Hody* could have told you, and ought to have told the World, that the Fifteenth Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, not only frees them from all *Cenſure*, but gives them the *Honour of the Orthodox*, and incourageth all Perſons in this caſe ſo to do, as being the way *to preſerve the Church from Schiſm and Diviſions*.

To juſtifie a Lay-deprivation, you fetch an Example from the Jewiſh Church, telling us, *That* Solomon *deprived* Abiathar *of the High Prieſthood, upon a provocation meerly in Civils*, p. 21. But againſt this you your ſelf have brought ſuch juſt exceptions, as neither you, nor all your Party will be able to take off; for if the Crime was nothing like, if there was ſuch a difference between the Conſtitutions of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Churches, if it was a manifeſt Ceſſion on *Abiathar*'s part (all which you have well proved,) then that inſtance can by no means come up to this caſe. To theſe you might have added ſeveral other things; as, Firſt, That his Crime was High Treaſon;

ſon; and to what purpoſe ſhould he inſiſt on his right to the Prieſthood, who had no right to his Life? Secondly, That *Solomon* did no more than Juſtice in reſtoring the Line of *Eleazar*. Thirdly, That it was in compliance with the known Will of God; for it is expreſly ſaid, that he did it, *That he might fulfil the Word of the Lord*, 1 King. 2. 27. Fourthly, That he had the concurrence of the Church, and was truly King; all which conſiderations laid together, will make this inſtance utterly uſeleſs in this caſe: And after all, perhaps the very Inſtance it ſelf comes to no more than this, That *Abiathar* being both in the Eye of the King and the Church, too ſcandalous and dangerous a Perſon for the diſcharge of that great Office, was debarr'd the execution of it, and another deputed to it; for that he was deprived of the Name, Honour, and ſhare in the profits of the Prieſthood, I believe cannot be eaſily proved; for after all this, I am ſure the Title is ſtill allowed him, 1 King. 4. 4. and if the Fields at *Anathoth* did belong to the High *Prieſts*, it ſeems to put the matter out of doubt; ſo that it ſeems to be a kind of ſtate of Suſpenſion very juſt upon him, whatever was the power of the *King*, or however done with or without the concurrence of the Church; though I think it is not to be doubted, but that the Church was ready enough to do her part againſt ſuch a *Perſon*: Such things are not ſo nicely recorded; and Kings are often ſaid to do, what they either command, direct, or procure to be done, where others are concerned and conſenting, though not mentioned. This inſtance indeed proves, that *Solomon* did not think fit to deal with the High Prieſt, though a Traytor, as with other Men; which ſhews the great Veneration they had for the Prieſthood; but ſure it might have been ſpared in theſe times, wherein your unfaithfulneſs hath taught Men daily to ridicule and abuſe it.

Some other Inſtances you produce, which are drawn out with much pomp and oſtentation; but I will not trouble my ſelf, or others, to examine them; becauſe you fairly confeſs, that after the great Cry they afford little Wool; and though they make a noiſe and ſhew, yet they were really inſignificant; for when you were *grown weary with ſtrugling*, (as you call it,) you freely gave them up, and acknowledge, *That an Act of a State Chriſtian, cannot alone vacate a Spiritual Charge*, p. 27. And *That the Conſent, publick and actual Concurrence of the Church, is neceſſary to give an Eccleſiaſtical Effect to Civil Ordinances, in matters of the Church*, p. 29. Now this Conceſſion overthrows your whole Book, and by being placed after the main Body of your Arguments, is it ſelf an Argument, that you had little Faith in them, however you endeavoured to ſtorish with them; for according to this our Biſhops muſt be Biſhops ſtill, and Biſhops of their reſpective

Sees,

Sees, and the Flocks muſt owe and pay the ſame Canonical Obedience as ever to them, unleſs it can be proved, that they are alſo Canonically deprived. Now I thought it had been a plain caſe, that they were never Canonically depoſed, and ſo I believe did others, even their Enemies; for I have not yet heard of any that offered at the contrary. But here come you like a Spiritual Juggler; and as they with tricks deceive our Senſes, ſo would you with ſham arguments our Underſtandings, and perſuade us that even this hath been done alſo; for, ſay you, *The Church ought to empty the Sees of ſuch Incumbents that are dangerous to the Civil State.* But, Sir, muſt the Church caſt out her Biſhops as oft as they will not comply with Uſurpers in their unjuſt deſires, and endeavour to gratifie and ſecure them in their unjuſt Poſſeſſions by wicked acts on their own part? He that will dare to ſay this, (and no leſs you muſt mean, if you ſpeak to the purpoſe,) I think the Church ought to ſpue him out of her Mouth. But you ſay the thing is done *by acts of Separation properly Eccleſiaſtical, the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitical Church taking the Juriſdiction, till the Chapter Elect, and Biſhops Conſecrate another.* Sir, though by experience I find theſe to be very *Taking* times, yet I cannot underſtand this *taking Juriſdiction*; Sure you mean Uſurping, Robbing or Stealing: This is no ſmall caſt; you have out-thrown the *Scotch* Doctor full two Bars length; for this is a trick not only to tranſlate our Allegiance, but our Canonical Obedience too; yea, more than this, to ſeize the Juriſdiction of that very Biſhop, to whom we have ſworn Canonical Obedience. O bleſſed days wherein nothing is ſacred, nothing certain either in Church or State! Yet I muſt confeſs this was done, and there was one made a good bargain to carry it on; but if you ſhould offer to *take* his Juriſdiction of the Archbiſhoprick of *York*, as he did a better Man's, we ſhould ſoon hear from him in another ſtrain. But, Sir, to be ſhort, you cannot but know, that the Dean and Chapter have no Juriſdiction over their Metropolitane; and the See muſt be vacant before they can proceed to Election: But in this caſe, if they take upon them to Elect, when the Church hath not depoſed, and that Election be followed by a Conſecration, they only ſet up Altar againſt Altar, create a formal Schiſm, and are liable to the cenſure of the Church, and ſtand actually cenſured by the Canons; and this being the Caſe, the Act of the Dean and Chapter argues only their own ſin and ſhame: And indeed if it were be to laid open, it would appear to be as indiſcreet and weak an act in ſome, and as inſolent and vile an act in others, as almoſt any this Revolution has produced; but let that paſs, the act is in it ſelf null and void, and therefore cannot prejudice the Right of the Metropolitane.

But

But leſt the Dean and Chapter ſhould not be ſtrong enough, you call in the Convocation for help: And, 1. You tell us what your worthy Conformiſts did, and what was their Opinion; but this is juſt the Proverb, *Ask my fellow, if I be a Thief*; but (ſay you) *Their ſending the Convocation ſhews their Subjection, and condemns Recuſancy as an Error*, (p. 28.) And we ſay this is many Errors; but what then? The Caſe is diſputed between us; you ſay you do ſo, therefore it is and muſt be ſo; as if your irreligious diſloyal actions could juſtifie not only the evil you have done, but all that you ſhall proceed to do: But the *ſilence of the Convocation* you think will work Miracles, for that *argues their Opinion to be, that they were in this to yield to the State*; (p. 28.) And thus we are utterly undone with the Arguments of Lovers and Fools. *Silence gives conſent*: There muſt be many other concurring circumſtances, before the leaſt conſent can be preſumed from ſilence; for otherwiſe it is often a ſign of indignation, ſcorn, ſullenneſs, yea, even of obſtinate denial it ſelf; and what they meant by their ſilence you may better gueſs, when you have reſolved this Quærie: Whether you can reaſonably think, that they would have choſen him for their Archbiſhop, whom they refuſed for their Prolocutor? But what if they were not ſo ſilent as here you make them? 'Tis pitty your Memory is not better, for through forgetfulneſs you give in evidence againſt your ſelf; for (p. 34.) you tell us of *a motion in the lower Houſe of Convocation for a Petition for the reſtitution of the Biſhops and (then) Suſpended Clergy*. One would think this look'd very kindly towards them, unleſs there be a Revolution alſo in Mens Senſe and Brains, and their meaning is to be underſtood, as they read *Hebrew*, backward; for otherwiſe no body would take petitioning for Men for appearing againſt them; but what if there had been none of this, but they had been eternally ſilent? Were ever Biſhops depoſed by ſilence? If you do not, you ought to know, that before a Biſhop can be depoſed, he muſt be judicially cited; upon his appearance he ought to have a full and fair hearing, a Crime or Crimes meriting Deprivation muſt be proved againſt him; and laſtly, a Canonical Sentence by Biſhops muſt be paſſed upon him, and publiſhed againſt him; and if they fail in any of theſe things, the whole proceedings are null: and when all this can be done by ſilence, I will yield you the Cauſe.

Your jumble of Q. *Mary*'s and Q. *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops I ſhall not examine, becauſe a full anſwer to that either already is or ſuddenly will come abroad. But I cannot but take notice of a Queſtion which you ſtart, that you may thence take occaſion to repreſent us to the Government, as the moſt dangerous Men in the World, and ſet them on to uſe the utmoſt cruelty to us, who have ſuffered ſo much already, that ſo you might end with a Sting in your Tail. The Queſtion is,

Whether

Whether he that hath unjuſtly gotten into a full Settlement upon another Prince's Dominions, ought to ſuccor the Church in thoſe Dominions? Now this is very diſingenuous dealing, for you cannot but know, that we diſpute not againſt, but ſubmit to a *full Settlement*; only we ſay, that a *full Settlement* in one, while another, who has Right, claims and endeavours to recover his Right, is contradictory non-ſenſe. You have been often told the meaning of a full Settlement, but wilfully ſhut your Eyes and will not ſee, though you Hypocritically pretend to deſire information: The Queſtion therefore ought to be in ſhort, whether an Uſurper ought to ſuccour the Church under his Uſurpation? Now though it is moſt certain, that in Duty and Conſcience he ought to *quit it*, yet becauſe thoſe Beaſts of Prey are rarely induced to part with their Quarry, the Queſtion muſt be, what is his Duty to the Church, if he will not quit his Uſurpation? And doubtleſs it is to ſuccour it, or at leaſt not to deſtroy it, as you and ſome others would perſuade him; and you might have been *ſo hardy as to affirm* this, though the Church would not *own him to be a lawfull Sovereign*; for if he have done evil himſelf, muſt all be made away with, who will not join with him in it, and approve of it? Muſt they be all ſerv'd as the *Highland Clan*, and have their Throats cut in their Beds, who contrary to their Knowledge and Conſcience will not own him to be the true Owner of his unjuſt gotten Goods: Your Reaſoning indeed ſhews the wretched neceſſity of ſinning, which Men are put upon, who reſolve by any means to maintain injuſtice, but doth not at all teach them what they ought to do: And it had more become you to have taught them ſome good, than to inſtigate them to more evil than they can do. But however none of theſe things ought to move a Chriſtian from his Duty, in which he muſt proceed, and leave the event to God, who knows beſt how to take care of his Church. The Bleſſed Jeſus hath left us a Religion, and authorized Perſons to teach and do all things concerning it, which will infallibly bring us to Heaven, if we be true to it. This nothing can take from us, if we our ſelves do not forſake it; in ſpight of Swords and Cannons, Tyrants and Devils, we may obtain Salvation, if we be firm to our Religion; but then if our Superiors ſet themſelves againſt it, we are to maintain it not by fighting, but ſuffering; and if it come to that hardſhip, to ſave our lives by loſing them; which is ſo far from endangering the loſs of Religion, that by experience it hath been found the greateſt means to propagate it: So that the ſecurity of the Chriſtian Religion lies in the Authority of our Saviour, and the Doctrine of the Croſs; but you give both away, while you preſs a compliance with whatever a Prince ſhall think neceſſary for his ſecurity. At this rate there ſhould not be a Chriſtian under the Turk;

and

and you your ſelf muſt turn Turk to morrow, if your new Maſter, whom you perſuade to be more cruel than a Turk, ſhould declare for that Perſuaſion. This I think is indeed *to expoſe the Nation to an utter Deſtruction at the pleaſure of any one*, that is uppermoſt: For whom it doth not Butcher, it will Damn.

I ſhould here have concluded, but that I cannot forbear to obſerve, how you make manifeſt that great Love, Tenderneſs, and Reſpect you profeſs to have for us, by your utmoſt endeavours to expoſe our Reverend Fathers. *I know* (ſay you p. 34.) *a Dioceſs, where the Biſhop utterly ſuppreſſed a Petition ſigned by his Clergy, and ready to be preſented to their Majeſties for the Reſtitution of the Metropolitane, the Biſhop, and the ſuſpended Clergy of that Dioceſs.* I am apt to think this to be that very Biſhop, to whom you have ſworn and owe Canonical Obedience, though at preſent you have tranſlated it to an *Epiſcopal-Preſbyterian, who baptizes without the ſign of the Croſs*; but if you will not obey, yet in civility you ſhould forbear to reproach your good old Biſhop, or to ſtir up the Government againſt him: But what if he did ſuppreſs a Petition? If you had told his Reaſons, you will find, that you had better have held your Tongue. If you conſider with your ſelf, perhaps you will remember, that there was ſomething in that Petition for a ſubſiſtence for the Biſhop out of the Revenues of the Biſhoprick; and might he not modeſtly and Chriſtianly ſay, *That he deſired not the Profits of the Biſhoprick, if he ſhould not be ſuffered to diſcharge the Office.* And here by the way behold the true Character of *Dutch* kindneſs; when the mercies of the wicked had given away the Eſtates of ſo many thouſands, who, if they had continued honeſt, muſt have ſuffered, they left a liberty to make proviſion for twelve; but the good Man to whom the diſpoſal was left, like a truſty Steward never allowed one Penny or Farthing. But to return to the Biſhop you ſpake of, there is another account I can give you. A Petition of the like nature was ſigned by the Clergy of another Dioceſs, and brought up to Town to be preſented, but all the Avenues of *Whitehall* and *Kenſington* were ſtopt, and *William* fretted and fum'd, and begg'd, and pray'd of all about him, that they would never ſuffer it to come near him; nor could it ever find a way, but they were forced to let it fall and die. Now he knew this miſcarriage, and the Reſolution taken up at Court; and ſhall any Man blame him for eaſing his Clergy of that Labour and Charges, of which he was beforehand aſſured there would come no good?

But you go on and tell us, that you have it from *a good Hand, that a motion for ſuch a Petition was ſtifled in the lower Houſe of Convocation, upon a report made of my Lord Archbiſhop* Sancroft's *requeſt to the contrary*: But what if that report bely'd his Grace? This is no

ſuch ſtrange thing in theſe times; for I think it is out of doubt, whether this Government hath gotten more by Lyes or Arms? His Lordſhip is living, and (thanks be to God) in health; and before you had publiſhed ſuch a ſtory of him, you ought not only to have been better aſſured of the Truth of it; but alſo, if poſſible, upon what account he did it. Whether the tale be true or falſe, I know not, and therefore muſt leave it to his Grace, to own or diſown it, according to the truth of the matter, as he ſhall ſee cauſe; and if he own it, I make no doubt, but he will give very good Reaſons for what he did: But if I might be allowed to ſpeak my own thoughts, I humbly conceive, that one great Reaſon, which might make our Biſhops under a Lay-Suſpenſion more averſe to Petitioning, was, That whether ſuch Petitions were granted or not, it would certainly redound to their harm, but could do them no good; for if they were denied, it would expoſe the Government, and conſequently more incenſe it againſt them; but if they were granted, it would entangle them in freſh difficulties, and run them into greater dangers; for it would have been expected, that then they ſhould not only have approved the Prayers, which were iſſued out during their Suſpenſion, but alſo ſhould tamely have gone along with all Orders, that came to them; and perhaps they could as ill do this, as take the Oaths; yet if they had not done it, there can be no doubt, but they would have been more ſeverely proſecuted than ever; and thus might have brought not only their Eſtates but their Lives in danger. Now it is a hard caſe, that you cannot ſuffer Good Men to act with common prudence; but there are ſome Men are very angry, that they cannot make them act like Madmen; for no other Reaſon, but that they would have them precipitate themſelves into deſtruction: But you might have forborn to tell theſe Stories, ſeeing they do your Cauſe no good but hurt; for the leſs they regard your Government, the more ſtrongly they aſſert their own Authority. Do not they affirm themſelves to be the Canonical Biſhops? Was not the Archbiſhop thruſt out of his Palace under pretence of Law, and his Nephew impriſoned and fined for not making a preſent ſubmiſſion; ſure you cannot take this for renouncing their Right, or think it to be a *diſcharging the Clergy in their admiſſion of new Biſhops.* And yet you endeavour to make us believe this: But what unheard of Impudence is this, that a parcel of Perjured Fellows ſhould, contrary to their former Oaths to manifeſt Right, and their own known Duty, forſake their own Biſhops, and enter into a Schiſm againſt them, and then cry out, *Their Biſhops have left them.* Theſe things therefore plainly making againſt you, I cannot think you tell theſe Stories for any other reaſon than to gratifie your Malice, and to ſet the Government, like the *Devil* upon *Job*, to plague them more

and

and more, whoſe Crimes are only their Innocence and Sufferings: Sir, a Day will come, when you muſt anſwer for theſe things; and therefore you would do well in time to conſider how fatal the miſchiefs you deſign to others may prove to your own Soul; and repent not only of that, but alſo that you *have forſaken your firſt Love*, and return from *whence you are faln*: And I dare engage to aſſure you, that a great Living, with Perjury and in Schiſm, ſhall not afford you half the Comfort, which you may find in recovering a Good Conſcience by Repentance.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 3. line 32. dele *of*. p. 4. l. antepenult. r. *of* Partiality. p. 5. l. 18. r. were *not* accuſtomed. p. 6. l. 15. r. *Diſingenuity*. p. 8. l. 38. r. *could* rely. p. 9. l. 6. r. *popiſh* Principles. p. 10. l. penult. r. *captiouſly*. p. 13. l. 9. r. *their* lawfull King. p. 14. l. 14. r. *by* the Laws. l. 21. for conſented r. *concerned*. p. 15. l. 15. r. apt to *grate* the *Ears* of Schiſmaticks. p. 16. l. 30. after Parliament add *which was built upon the foundation*. p. 19. l. 34. r. *has* Right. p. 22. l. 3. r. than *ever*. p. 23. l. ult. r. *acquire* a juſt. p. 26. l. ult. r. my *Friend*. p. 30. l. 28. r. *argument*. p. 32. l. 3. r. yet *when* he. p. 33. l. 40. r. Jan. 1689.